




Gift of -  
J. E. Hoick





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation







*J. K. Rosecrans*

THE

EVANGELICAL

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

M. L. STOEVER,

PROFESSOR IN PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE.

---

VOLUME XV.

Property of

CBPL

Please return to

Graduate Theological  
Union Library

---

GETTYSBURG:

H. C. NEINSTEDT, PRINTER, FRANKLIN STREET,  
NEAR CORNER OF WEST.

1864.

324P1

*Handwritten signature*

v. 15  
1864

PACIFIC LUTHERAN  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
THE LIBRARY





## CONTENTS OF NO. LVII.

---

Article.	Page
<p>I. THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE—THE CALL TO THE GOSPEL MINISTRY,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By REV. M. LOY, A. M., Delaware, Ohio.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>II. THE OBJECT OF LIFE,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By THOMAS H. STOCKTON, D. D., Philadelphia.</p>	<p>43</p>
<p>III. SACRAMENTAL MEDITATIONS ON THE PRESENCE OF THE GLORIOUS BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IN THE HOLY SUPPER—TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. ERNST SARTORIUS,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By REV. G. A. WENZEL, A. M., Philadelphia.</p>	<p>71</p>
<p>IV. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF FASTING,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By REV. M. VALENTINE, A. M., Reading, Pa.</p>	<p>113</p>
<p>V. REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MIN- ISTERS,.....</p>	<p>129</p>
<p>VI. DR. JOHNSON: HIS WORKS AND HIS REVIEWERS, 141</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By S. AUSTIN ALLIBONE, LL. D., Philadelphia.</p>	<p>141</p>
<p>VII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS, .....</p>	<p>155</p>

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review* for July contains "Undeveloped Resources of the Church," by Rev Dr. Sprague; M. Flacius Illyricus and his Times, by Dr. Schaeffler; "The Divine and Human Natures in the Son of God by Dr. Lintner; "Luther's Battle Song of the Reformation" by Dr. Reynolds; "The Lord's Supper," by Prof. Sternberg; and "God's Argument against Oppression." We congratulate the contributors and friends of the *Review*, published as it is at Gettysburg, at the promptitude with which they have issued the present number. Although the office was "rummaged" by the Rebels, and the last article, God's Argument against Oppression, was actually in print at the time, yet scarcely had the battle been fought and the enemy retreated before the number was issued. The articles of the number are all able and scholarly.—*The Evangelist* (New York.)

We are glad to find the *Evangelical Review* enter into a discussion of the great question of Slavery and Emancipation, for we have long been convinced, that these momentous questions, on whose solution depends the whole future of our country, can be brought to a permanent and satisfactory solution only by the Christian Churches. The *Evangelical Review* discusses them in the right spirit; "The Universal Fatherhood of God and the Universal Brotherhood of Man," are in fact "God's Argument against Oppression." If the Lutheran Church, of which the *Evangelical Review* is an able and respected organ, unites, for attaining this end, her powerful influence with that of other Christian churches, it will be a source of great blessing for the country.—*The Methodist* (N. Y.)

This number closes the fourteenth volume. It must be gratifying to the members of the Lutheran Church, that they have been able to sustain their *Quarterly*, even in the midst of times, which have compelled many similar publications to succumb. A glance at the present number is sufficient to satisfy any one that the character of the publication is well sustained.—*Ger. Ref. Messenger*.

We were not prepared to see the *Evangelical Review* so soon after the Battle of Gettysburg, but it came as promptly and looking as well, as if nothing had happened. The Church is under great obligations to Prof. Stoever for his labors in furnishing us with the *Review*. Each minister in the church ought to feel under obligation to help support our *Quarterly*. If its circulation were what it should be, not only would the benefits of such a publication be more extensively felt, but the faithful and able Editor would receive a proper reward for his labor.—*Lutheran Observer*.

The fifty-sixth number of the *Evangelical Review* has reached us. It comes still within the month in which it is due, in spite of the storm of War which burst upon the place of its publication in the earlier days of the ever memorable July of this year.—*Lutheran & Missionary*.

The *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, edited by Prof. Stoever of Pennsylvania College, has already made its appearance. As usual we find it filled with matter of the most instructive and interesting character. The *Review* is published quarterly and is devoted to the exposition and defence of the Lutheran Church, and has among its contributors some of the most able champions of that denomination.—*Star & Banner*.

THE  
EVANGELICAL  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LVII.

JANUARY, 1864.

ARTICLE I.

THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE.—THE CALL TO THE GOSPEL  
MINISTRY.\*

By REV. M. LOY, A. M., Delaware, Ohio.

WE have endeavored to render it plain that although every Christian is a priest, yet not every one is a pastor. All have equal rights, but equality of rights does not imply possession of the same office. The incumbent of the ecclesiastical office exercises common rights not in his own name, but in that of those who hold the rights in common. He is the agent of the community whose common rights are exercised by the office. Such agent cannot appoint himself, but must be chosen by the persons for whom he is to act. Hence the necessity of a call to the Gospel Ministry.

§1. *No one has, the right to exercise the functions of the priesthood, or the power of the keys, publicly in the Church, without a call.*

This is evident from Holy Scripture and from reason, from the Symbols and the best writers of our Church.

\* *Vide* Evangelical Review, Vol. XIII. p. 299.

1. The Holy Scriptures, while their teachings in reference to the common rights of the Christian priesthood are quite explicit, just as manifestly teach that none should presume to exercise common rights in the Church without common consent. The Lord prohibits such arrogance. When He wants men to minister He will call them; whether He does so immediately, as in extraordinary cases, or mediately, through the Church, as ordinarily, the prerogative is His, and the sin of officiating without a mission is heinous. His controversy with false prophets in ancient times was not only on account of their falsehoods, but also on account of their officious running without a vocation. For thus saith the Lord: "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied; Jer. 23: 21. Indeed, the two sins of teaching lies and teaching without authority are intimately connected. For the inflated self-conceit which induces a man to think he must needs be a public teacher, because of his transcendent abilities, even though the Church should be too stupid to appreciate them, and the wild enthusiasm which prompts the fanatic to imagine himself especially called of God to enlighten the world, even though benighted Christendom failed to perceive it, are not likely to draw their possessors to the word of truth to learn God's will in meekness there. In the New Testament the necessity of being sent in order to be a legitimate preacher in the Church is expressly asserted. "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they are sent?" Rom. 10: 14, 15. That they are sent by the Lord, whose truth they preach and in whose name they preach it, is undeniable, and is just as little denied by those who insist according to Scripture, that the call comes from the congregation, as by those who maintain that it comes directly from the Lord or through the pastorate. All are agreed that the call is necessary, and this is what we are at present concerned in showing. To this the manifold examples recorded in the Scriptures also bear testimony. "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Heb. 5: 4. Of the Levitical priesthood it is said: "The Lord hath chosen you to stand before Him, to serve Him, and that ye should minister unto Him and burn incense before Him." 1 Chron. 23: 13. And as these ordinary pas-



tors of the people were divinely called, so were the extraordinary teachers who are styled prophets. Isaiah declares: "I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I, send me. And he said go." Is. 6: 8, 9. Jeremiah says: "The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." Jer. 1: 4, 5. Ezekiel testifies that the Lord said to him: "Son of man I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that hath rebelled against me \* \* I do send thee unto them; and thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God." Ez. 2: 3, 4. And "the word of the Lord came to Jonah, the son of Amitai, saying, Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it." Indeed, no intelligent reader of the Bible could suppose that any true prophet of God ever ran when he was not sent; they could be God's messengers only when God commissioned them. And so it was also in the new dispensation from the beginning, and is so now. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." Of the harbinger of this merciful dispensation it is said: "There was a man sent from God whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe." Jno. 1: 6, 7. The first preachers of the glad tidings that the Saviour had come, were called and sent as messengers to fallen man. "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. 10: 5, 7. And the same is true of all their successors in the pastoral office. Elders were ordained in every Church, receiving the ministerial calling and ministerial commission. Acts 14: 23; Tit. 1: 5. So it must ever be; for the command is to go into all the world and teach all nations, and this is to be continued unto the end of the world. Matt. 28: 19, 20; wherefore we are instructed to "pray the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth laborers into His harvest." Matt. 9: 38. Without such mission, and call the Scriptures know no right to administer the pastoral office.

II. From the premises furnished by inspiration, moreover, reason readily deduces the necessity of such call. For that which is equally the property of all cannot be administered by one without the consent of the rest. But we have seen that the Lord has conferred the keys upon the Church, not upon select individuals within her pale. To officiate without a call is therefore a violation of the rights of the Christian community. It is at once a sin against the Lamb who grants and the Bride who receives them. That each individual Christian possesses the keys and is entitled to their administration is true: but to infer from this that each one may, therefore, administer them in any place and manner he pleases is as unreasonable as it is unscriptural. The logical inference is just the reverse of this, so far as the public administration in the Church is concerned. Privately each one exercises his right as best he can, and spreads the truth in love according to the ability which the Lord bestows. As long as the individual, in the exercise of his rights, does not encroach upon the rights of other individuals, no one is authorized to interfere. But it must be apparent to every one who is willing to see, that just as soon as each exercise assumes a public form in the congregation something more than the rights of an isolated individual enter into the question. The individual is then merged in the congregation: he is no longer isolated. One has just as much right to administer the means of grace as another. All are equally privileged. They are one in Christ, striving to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. They act as a corporation, not as a mass of incoherent particles. It is totally at variance with any adequate idea of an organized community in general, and with the idea of a Christian Church as presented in the Bible in particular, to suppose that each member of the body may act, in matters pertaining to all, without any regard to the other members. Indeed, according to such a doctrine the Church could never assume a visible form on earth: there might be Christian individuals, but certainly no organized Christian congregation. But the Holy Spirit gathers the people of God. They are joined together in one heart and one mind. In such union they live and love and labor: in such union they publicly administer the means of grace. Thus the Master wills, thus the Holy Spirit prompts. For such administration they must necessarily appoint agents. The word cannot be preached by the tongue and lips in the congregation at once, nor the

sacraments administered by the thousand hands. These agents are the ministers of the Church. They exercise the rights of all, and do it in the name of all. But this they can do only when called to such office. To pretend to act for others without their appointment or consent is palpable arrogance, and tramples upon their rights. For since Christians have all things in common, as we have shown and proved, it could not be right for one to push himself forward and appropriate to himself what belongs to us all. Let him maintain this right, and exercise it, where there is no other person who has also received it. But this is required by the rights of the community, that one, or as many as the congregation chooses, should be elected and accepted, who shall administer the offices publicly in the place and name of all those who have precisely the same rights." Luther's W. 10, 1857. And as this is the only way in which the rights of all can be preserved inviolate while all are discharging the duty of disseminating the truth, so it is the only possible way in which the decency and order enjoined in the word of God can be maintained without sacrificing these rights. The Church would become a Babel if each one, confounding the possession of a right with the authority publicly to exercise it in the Church, would consider himself a public functionary. When it is granted that all have an equal right to the keys, and that the Lord requires all things to be done decently and in order, it follows by inevitable necessity that one must be called to the public office before he can lawfully administer it. Nor can we see any objection to this in the diversity of gifts with which men are endowed. That such diversity exists is confessed by all. But this does not imply that the requisite endowments will or can elevate their possessors to the pastoral office without a vocation. An arrangement by which the possession of the necessary qualifications should in itself endue a person with pastoral prerogatives would neither preserve order nor rights. For in some places there are many who have the qualifications needed, and the public exercise of their gifts, in the absence of any designation of those among them who should officiate, could only result in confusion. Besides, there are always many who suppose themselves to possess that, of which they are utterly devoid. If each person were left to determine for himself whether he has the qualifications required for the ministry, it must be obvious to all who have any knowledge of human nature in its ruined condition that not a few would

rush into the office without the proper gifts, and many who possess them would be deterred from entering upon it by that very meekness and humility which render them specially fitted for it. The apostle deemed it necessary to exhort even Christians not to think of themselves more highly than they ought to think, and not all who are found in the visible congregation are even Christians. It is not for the individual to be the judge of his own abilities; others can do this much better, and others are appointed to do it in the case of a candidate for the ministry. The call to the office is the proper recognition of the candidate's gifts. And it need not be at all feared that those, who have the requisite gifts of grace, will quarrel with the Church for choosing others, if she sees fit, rather than themselves to the holy office. They will rather rejoice that others are deemed better qualified than they, and will use their own abilities in the sphere which Providence assigns them, fully and justly assured that if God wants them in the ministry He will find them, and call them in the proper way, and that if he assigns them some other vocation, His assignment is their advantage. God bestows gifts in order that there may be proper persons to whom to extend the call, not by any means to render the call superfluous. And as order can be maintained only by such designation of persons to administer the office, not by the mere existence of requisite gifts, so can the common rights of Christians be preserved only in this way. For the fact that one has more talents than another does not give him higher privileges in the kingdom of God; he is a king and priest like all other believers, and nothing more. To say that he has the office because he has the gifts, is to make great Christian rights dependent on endowments which cannot be deemed essential to Christian character. Against this every believer should feel bound to enter his solemn protest. We are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and we cannot possibly be more. But if those who are less gifted than others have still the same rights as those who have the highest abilities, which cannot be denied, it is just as undeniable that their consent must be obtained before those common rights can be exercised in their name, in other words, the agent must be called by those for whom he acts. They should choose the person who is qualified, but the choice, not the qualification, constitutes the minister. The conclusion from plain Bible



truth is unavoidable that no one can lawfully hold the office without a call to this effect. And

III. In accordance with this, our Symbols also, teach when they declare, as already shown, that "Concerning Church government it is taught that no one should teach or preach publicly in the Church, or administer the sacraments, without a regular call." (Augs. Conf. 14.) No words can be plainer. A clear distinction is made between public teaching and private, and between teaching in the Church, and in places where the Church is not yet established. The means of grace are every Christian's inheritance, and the duty of administering them for the conversion of souls and the edification of the Church is implied in their possession. Such administration is not only an inalienable right but, because it is God's will that souls should be saved by the employment of these means, a solemn duty. The Christian therefore exercises the functions of his priesthood in his own family, not in virtue of a right communicated by the pastor of the congregation, but in virtue of the right communicated by his Lord to him, as to every other believer, through faith. So he counsels and admonishes and comforts his brethren in his private intercourse with them, not because he has received a special congregational call or pastoral vocation to do this, but because as a spiritual priest and as possessor of the keys through faith he has an immediate invitation from the Lord to do it, as every believer has. This the article obviously implies. It is much to be desired that those who are sincere in their efforts to understand the doctrine of the Lutheran Church would give attention to the careful wording of the Confession. It does not say that no one should teach or preach without a call. It would not say the truth, if it said this and meant, by the word a vocation call, from the Church. Nor would the practice of the Church have corresponded with it. For it never was claimed that she made or now makes a congregational call necessary to authorize a believer to teach privately. No one who will fairly examine the article, with its guarded expressions and well defined limitations, can conclude that teaching and preaching, as such, require a regular call. No one should teach or preach *publicly* without a call. But there is still another qualification, which shows that the rule requiring a vocation does not only not apply to the activity of believers in their private relations, but not even to the public exercise of their priestly functions in all cases. Where no

Church exists, no call is requisite. A believer whose lot is cast among the heathen need not wait for a vocation to authorize him to preach to them the unsearchable riches of Christ. Whence, indeed, should he receive a call? No intelligent Christian would, we trust, so far forget his character and calling as a Christian, as to accept a call from the heathen, while still remaining such, to become their minister and pastor. When a number of believers has once gathered by the divine means, they must call some one to the pastoral office: but until there are such it would be absurd to speak of a regular call among them. The single Christian is called to win their souls to Christ; he has not only a right to teach them the truth, but would manifest a want of faith and charity if he refused to do it when circumstances permitted. Nor need he shun publicity in doing it: he should pile their benighted souls and bring them to the marvellous light of the Gospel as best he can, privately or publicly. "It is taught that no one should teach or preach publicly *in the Church* without a regular call." The Church has stated her doctrine with precision and abides by it with firmness. She has no wavering faith nor hesitating expression. She is careful to curtail no privilege and encroach upon no right of the lowliest believer, for her treasure is the treasure of believers. But as the welfare of the congregation, and the rights of believers associated in the congregation require that the public administration of the means of grace should be conferred upon and, where possible, confined to persons called to this office, and as God has been pleased to command such order, she maintains the rights of the ministry, as the divinely instituted representatives of the congregation, just as sedulously as the rights of the spiritual priesthood of all believers. Whatever her enemies may say to the contrary, her Confessions, while affirming that the keys are given originally and immediately to the Church, condemn all those false theories which lead to anarchy and confusion in their public administration, and insists that none should presume to act as a public officer without being duly called. And, as we have abundantly shown, the uniform doctrine of her most distinguished teachers accords with this. We know of none, indeed, who ever taught otherwise within her limits. Some have been charged with doing so, but falsely. Especially was this the case in reference to Luther. But we have already quoted passages in which he expressly denies the unjust accusation. His works everywhere deny it, even if

it had not been done expressly. The papists so little understood his defense of the Christian's rights that they naturally supposed him to identify the spiritual priesthood and ecclesiastical pastorate. Besides this, they trembled for their honors and emoluments, and not without reason. Such a distinction as they made between the laity and the clergy he never acknowledges. Their unscriptural priesthood he did indeed labor to undermine and overthrow, for it robbed the people of their noblest rights and stripped them of their choicest privileges in the Church. With this Luther's doctrine was and is inconsistent. But he never uttered a single word in conflict with the scriptural doctrine of the Christian ministry: on the contrary he said and wrote much to defend and elucidate it as a divine institution, not to lord it over God's heritage, but to minister in the Church, where all are one in Christ, though their offices be different.

§2. *The Call is given mediately through the Congregation only.*

The call to the pastoral office is not given immediately, but mediately, and the medium employed is the congregation, not some different power.

I. The call is not given immediately. It always comes from the Lord and renders the called person in an especial sense a servant of the Lord. But this does not imply that God must give the call immediately, since a mediate call is just as much divine as an immediate one.

1. There have been pastors and teachers who were immediately called. This all who read the Scriptures know. To the prophets under the old dispensation the word of the Lord came directly and called them to their exalted mission immediately, as the extraordinary character of their office would lead us to expect. And the same is true of the first preachers of the Gospel after the advent of Christ: the apostles were all called to their great work immediately by the Lord. In both these cases it could not well be otherwise. A new order was to be introduced, and this of course must break in on the accustomed and ordinary course of things. Beginnings are always, in the nature of the case, different from the normal condition of things established. The first disciples were called to the marvellous light of the Gospel, as well as to an apostleship under it immediately by the Lord; but it is plain that the ordinary vocation into God's kingdom is given in a different way since the Lord is no

longer visibly present among men, and so is also the ordinary vocation to the office of the Church. Not that it is essential in itself that the call should be mediate, or that God could not give it without the Church. He has conferred it immediately, and no power could prevent Him from doing it again, if it thus seemed good in His sight. But, although they have been, yet

2. Persons are not immediately called to the ministry now. The case of the apostles proves no rule in this respect. If all the circumstances were now the same we could appeal to the fact of the immediateness of their call in proof of the immediateness of the call in general. But the rule is that the call should be mediate, and the circumstances in the cases of immediateness show why they are to be properly regarded as exceptions. The prophetic office was established not as the regular pastorate in the old dispensation, but in addition to it, as a remedy for evils growing out of the unfaithfulness of those who were incumbents of the regular office. Extraordinary officers could of course not be expected to receive their commissions in the ordinary way. The apostolic office was a means of founding the Church in its specifically Christian form. A Church must be organized before it can call its pastors. This fact, which is self-evident, is generally overlooked by those who argue against congregational rights on the ground of apostolic practice. The pastors of our present churches are not apostles, although the apostles were the first incumbents of the ministerial office. These lived and labored in peculiar circumstances and were endowed with peculiar powers. They were missionaries to organize congregations, and missionaries in a different sense from those which are sent forth now, inasmuch as their calling was to be inspired messengers to establish Christianity upon earth. Their field was the whole world, and their miraculous powers attested their divine mission and the truth of their message. All this should be considered by those who think the whole question of the ministry settled by a mere reference to the nature and powers of the apostleship. Of persons claiming an immediate call, or the whole world as their field of labor, and on this ground refusing to admit the necessity of the Church's call and to respect its assignment of a special parish, to which their labors must be confined, we must demand miracles also in proof of their apostolic character and commission, the absence of which evinces their claims to be mere arrogance. And if they will not subject them-



selves to the biblical tests of an extraordinary mission, they should certainly be willing, if disposed to be at all reasonable, to limit their claims to the ordinary office, and subject themselves to the regulations bearing upon it. They should not expect Christians to respect their pretensions, when they claim extraordinary powers, without a single evidence to establish their claim. They should expect rather to be rebuked for their presumption or pitied for their simpleness. Evidence sufficient to satisfy men of a call must always be given, not because the efficacy of the means of grace depends on the validity of the administrator's call, but because the order and peace of the Church requires the call to be respected, and this can of course be only, where its possession is known. The mediate call is given by a congregation and publicly certified, that whosoever will may know it. How should or could the immediate call be known and certified otherwise than it is in the cases recorded in Scripture, namely, by signs and wonders? When there can exist no certificate of men who witnessed the call, there must be this certificate of God, which all the prophets and apostles had. Those who come as teachers without such testimony must be rejected. Imposters are easily discovered in this way. "When they are asked about their vocation, and requested to say who told them to creep hither and come and preach in a corner, they are unable to answer and show their commission. And I say the truth, if such creepers were guilty of no other offense, and were otherwise pure saints, this one fact that they come without commission and call, is sufficient to prove them messengers and teachers of the devil. For the Holy Ghost does not creep, but flies openly from heaven. Serpents creep, but doves fly \* \* Here there is no other remedy but that both spiritual and temporal offices interfere. The spiritual must constantly and diligently instruct the people, that they may admit no creeper, but may recognize them as messengers of Satan, and ask them: Whence camest thou? Who sent thee? Who has commanded thee to preach to me? Where are thy papers and seal certifying that thou art sent by men? Where are thy miracles to show that thou art sent by God? Why dost thou not go to our pastor? Why dost thou secretly come to me and creep in a corner? Why dost thou not stand forth publicly? If thou art a child of light why dost thou fear the light? With such questions they could easily, I think, be driven back; for they cannot prove their call." Luther 39, 215-6. "In a

word. St. Paul will not tolerate the presumption and guilt of meddling with other men's matters ; each is to attend to his own business and vocation and leave others unmolested in attending to theirs. Then he may be wise, and teach and sing and read and explain, where he has authority to do it, until he is tried. If God desires, beside and above this order of offices and the call, to do something extraordinary and call some one apart from the prophets, He will prove this by miracles and signs, as He commanded the ass to speak and rebuke the prophet Baalam, her master. Num. 22: 28. Where He does not do this we should adhere to the appointed offices and commission and act accordingly." Ib. 223. As we are urged to beware of false prophets and to labor for the preservation of peace and order in the Church, we cannot, according to the Scriptures, regard a call which is not proved, and must reject all claims to an immediate call which, being extraordinary, is not extraordinarily certified by miracles. Such call and certification we have no reason to expect in these times, whilst the regular call to the regular office continues now as ever.

II. This call is given through the congregation. So the Scriptures teach, and so, in accordance with them, the Church teaches. In proof of this we offer the following evidence.

1. The Church must give the call, because she alone has the priesthood and can, therefore, alone confer the right of publicly exercising it. That the Church, and every individual member of the Church, possesses the spiritual priesthood, has already been proved. The inference from this is obvious. What the Church possesses can be conferred only by the Church ; and he who takes it without her consent and without having it immediately bestowed by the Lord, the original owner and donor, must be justly styled a thief and a robber. The ministerial office exercises functions which belong to all priests : it is instituted for the public administration of Christian gifts and privileges. The officer is the public agent of the Church, exercising common rights in the name of all. Who shall appoint such officer and agent ? When it is promptly answered, The Lord appoints him, expression is given to a manifest truth. The rights exercised and the means administered and the gifts imparted are all originally His, and all authority over them must of course remain His. But the husband surrenders no rights and titles when he makes his wife a partner in his possessions ;

the Lamb ceases not to be proprietor and ruler of all because He mercifully confers great gifts and privileges upon His Bride, the Church. The Lord appoints the pastor, certainly; but He does it not immediately; He does it not, in such a way, as to ignore the Church with the manifold privileges which He has Himself conferred upon her; He does it through His wife, whom He has made partner in the ownership of the sacerdotal powers which are exercised in the ministry. There exists no other authority by which the office could be conferred. The Lord was pleased to bestow on the believers the rights which it exercises, and to appoint the election of proper persons publicly to exercise them on behalf of all. The rights are lodged nowhere else but in the Church, and the authority to elect an agent to exercise them cannot be given to a body, different from that whose rights are to be exercised. No call can be valid, excepting the extraordinary immediate call, unless the Church confers it, or at least consents to it and thus grants authority to officiate. This inference is expressly drawn in our Symbols, and no one can doubt its Lutheran character, even if he were disposed to deny its Scripturalness. Among the proofs presented to establish the Church's right to elect pastors occurs this: "Finally, this is also confirmed by the words of St. Peter, when he says: 'Ye are a royal priesthood.'" These words refer to the true Church which, because she alone has the priesthood, must also have the power to elect and ordain ministers of the Church." (341, 69.) Nothing can be plainer than this argument: the Church has the priesthood, and therefore she must have the authority to appoint persons to exercise it. It is found frequently in the works of our theologians. Luther shows, in opposition to Emser, that no human ceremonies and no functions make a priest, but that "the priesthood and power must exist before, received in Baptism, common to all Christians through faith, by which they are built on Christ, the true High Priest, as St. Peter here declares. But to exercise such power and put it in practice is not proper for every person; this must be left to those who are called by the congregation or by those who have the congregation's command and will, who then act instead and in the name of the people and by common authority." 27: 316. It will be observed that Luther does not make it essential that the congregation should be immediately active in the election; nor has the Church ever deemed this essential.

But without the people who have the priesthood there can be no valid call to its exercise. They may call the minister immediately, or they may delegate the right of calling to an ecclesiastical council, or even to the State, only so that it be their right which is exercised. Hence Luther says: "Every one who would be a Christian should be certain, and should well consider it, that we are all alike priests, that is, that we all have equal authority in reference to the divine word and the holy sacraments. But it is proper for each one not to use them except by the consent of the congregation or the call of the superiors. For what belongs equally to all none can claim for himself in particular unless he is called." (W. 19: 139.) Those who have the priesthood can call persons or have them called to the office; but it is a manifest usurpation of others' rights to officiate without the call of those who possess the priesthood.

2. The Church must give the call because she alone has the keys. The fact of such possession we have also proved in the former article. But if she alone has the keys it follows of necessity that she alone can lawfully use them, and appoint the agent to do this in her stead, as she cannot do it without such agency. This inference is also drawn in the Symbols, where the argument to prove the congregation's right of calling, as based on the possession of the keys, stands thus: "To this place belong the words of Christ which testify that the keys are given to the whole Church, not to several special persons, as the text declares, where two or three are gathered together in my name, &c. (341: 68.) The Church, not some select persons, has the keys. They exist in the congregation, no matter how small it may be; where there are two or three, the Church's rights exist. But if the keys are not given to some select individuals, it cannot be claimed that they alone have the right of calling ministers to exercise them, as the papists dream; if they are given to the whole Church, the whole Church, not only the clergy, have the power to call the officers whose business it is to use them: whenever, as is declared in the paragraph preceding the words quoted, the Church is, there is the command to preach the Gospel, and there must accordingly be the power to choose and ordain ministers: and wherever such are needed, no matter how little the flock which is assembled in Jesus' name, the flock, having the keys, has the duty and of course the right of appointing them. And this argument the writers of our Church have always found co-



gent. It is used by them as an irrefragable proof of the proposition under consideration. "This is and must be our ground and firm rock, that where the Gospel is preached truly and purely there must be a holy Christian Church; whoever doubts this must doubt whether the Gospel is the word of God. But where there is a holy Christian Church, there must also be the sacraments, Christ Himself and the Holy Spirit. Now, if we are a holy Christian Church and possess the greatest and most necessary things, as the divine word, Christ, the Spirit, faith, prayer, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the keys, office, &c., must we not have the least also, namely, the right and power of calling persons to the office, who shall administer the word, Baptism, the Supper, and minister to us? What kind of a Church would this be if we had not such right? What would become of Christ's word: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there will I be in the midst of them?" And again: "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." "If two or three have such power, how much more a whole Church." (Luther 131: 374.) So Gerhard writes: "To whom Christ has given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to him belongs the right of calling ministers of the Church. But the keys of the kingdom were given by Christ to the whole Church. Therefore with the whole Church is the right of calling ministers." (Loc. 24: §87.) It is plain that, since Christ has given the keys to His Bride, her consent must be necessary to authorize any person to use her property; and no call can be valid which ignores her just claim.

3. That the Church must give the call is evident further from divine commands which imply this. Only when congregations can choose or refuse ministers is it possible to comply with the divine precepts requiring us to shun false doctrines and false teachers, and cling to those which are true. But such precepts abound in the Bible. "As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Gal. 1: 9. "Beware of false prophets, who come unto you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." Matt. 7: 15. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 Jno. 4: 1. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into

your house, neither bid him God speed : for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." 2 John 10, 11. If the congregation has no power to elect or reject a minister, how shall they guard against ravening wolves and the poison which they disseminate ? It will not be supposed that the numerous admonitions in this regard mean only that each individual is to distinguish the true from the false for himself, and keep silence about it : that he is to reject the error and the errorist in his own mind, but say nothing to any of the brethren. Such charity, which sees the wolf and gives no warning, the Scriptures cannot be charged with inculcating. But if each Christian is bound to reject the false doctrine and the false teacher, and to do this openly, each Christian must necessarily have a voice in the election of the teacher ; for it is a manifest contradiction to say that we must adhere to or reject a teacher, according as he is true or false, and yet that we have no choice. We must express our adherence to or rejection of the proposed pastor either by vote or by separating from the congregation. And it will not be presumed that the ordinary way of expressing the rejection of a false teacher is to leave the congregation. The proper way is to reject the teacher and preserve the congregation entire, if possible. But this cannot be done unless the members are permitted to give expression to their conviction by their vote. In no conceivable way can believers prove all things and beware of false prophets without the power of election, if congregational organizations are to be preserved. Nor will the case be remedied by saying that congregations must indeed preserve the right of election, if the members would discharge their duty of preserving the purity of doctrine according to their ability, but the call is different from such election and is given by a different body from the congregation. We shall come to speak presently of the field, to which one is called and its limits ; for the present it will suffice to observe that if one is a pastor before he is presented as a candidate for a congregation's election, he is not *their* pastor and, if rejected, cannot be : to them he will be to all intents and purposes an uncalled person, as he is in reality so long as no congregation has called him to their pastorate. "Whoever has the duty of discerning teachers from imposters, of proving sound doctrine, of distinguishing the voice of the Great Shepherd from the voice of the false shepherds, of not following but fleeing from strangers, of anathematizing those who preach a different Gospel from that preached by St.

Paul, must also have the duty, in the proper mode and order, of calling the ministers of the Church. But the former is, by divine precept, incumbent on the sheep of Christ, or the hearers. Matt. 7: 15; Jno. 5: 39; 10: 27; Gal. 1: 9; 1 Thes. 5: 19-21; 1 Jno. 4: 1; 2 Jno. 10-11. Therefore the latter must be also. The inference is manifest. For if the hearers must beware of false prophets, they must in due order and form beware lest false teachers be introduced into the ministerial office, and consequently see to it that true and pious teachers are called to this ministry." Gerh. Loc. 24, §88.

4. The Church must have the right of calling the ministers because they are her ministers. This the Scriptures plainly affirm. "Let no man glory in men: for all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours." 1 Cor. 3: 21, 22. The ministers, however great may be their gifts, are not our lords that we should idolatrously cling to them and by our partiality for persons cause schisms in the body; they are ours, not we theirs. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus, the Lord: and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." 2 Cor. 4: 5. When erring men are driven to the desperate expedient of interpreting this passage as ironical, they furnish the best evidence of its decisiveness. For if it were at all possible to understand it in any other sense than that of making the pastor a servant of the Church, by no means the reverse, these men, in their zeal to subordinate the Church to the ministry, would find some explanation to square with their theory without resorting to the reckless shift of assuming the whole to be irony. One is strongly tempted to suppose, that it sounds quite ironical in the ears of such men for a bishop to declare that he preaches not himself, but Christ Jesus, the Lord. Let men say what they can to support unscriptural theories, the Scripture truth still remains clear, that ministers are the people's servants for Jesus' sake, whom they serve, while they serve His bride. St. Paul, speaking of himself, says: "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church: whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God, which is given to me for you to fulfil the word of God," Col. 1: 24, 25. But if pastors are the ministers of the Church, it must be obvious to all who are willing to see that she

must have the right of choosing her ministers. He who owns the property and whose servant or steward the minister is to be, must assuredly have the power of appointing him. If it should be objected to this, that it places the Church higher than the ministry and consequently degrades the latter, we admit the premise and deny the conclusion. We hold, as our fathers held and expressed it in the Symbols, that in "1 Cor. 3 St. Paul makes all ministers equal, and teaches that the Church is more than the ministers." (330, II.) But they who suppose themselves degraded by having the Church placed above them, have but carnal notions of Christian dignity and honor. The Master's words and example should have taught them better. "Jesus called them unto Him and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." Matt. 20: 25-28. "In the Church there will be bishops, pastors, preachers and other like official persons; these are to serve alone, and not to assume to themselves external power or glory on account of such office or service, as the Lord's example here shows. 'For whether is greater,' says He, 'he that sitteth at meat or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth.' Luke 22: 27. And Jno. 20: 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.' Now it is obvious to see that Christ was not sent by His Father to rule like a temporal prince and to seek temporal honors. But he was sent to preach and suffer. So He sends His servants. Therefore those who hold ecclesiastical offices should never permit this image to fade from their eyes and hearts and should beware of the devil, who would lead them to abuse their office for the attainment of personal honor and glory. In the temporal government it must be so; whoever has the office must also have the power. But in the Church 'serve' and suffer is the word, not rule and fare sumptuously. He that will do it, let him do it. He that will not do it, let him not boast that he ministers in the kingdom of Christ." (Luther 6: 389.) But if he is willing to serve, he must acknowledge the right of the Church, whose servant he would be, to call him to her service and not officiate at the bidding of those



who have no authority to call, in contempt of the flock who has it. For, in the words of Gerhard, "To those, whose ministers the pastors are and are called, must belong the right and power of calling the pastors. But they are and are called ministers of the Church. Therefore to the Church belongs the right and power of calling pastors. The minor proposition is proved by 1 Cor. 3: 21; 2 Cor. 1: 24; 1 Pet. 5: 2, 3." (*Loc. 24: 89.*)

That the Church has the right to call her ministers is thus established beyond controversy. She alone has the priesthood and keys and can alone confer the right of exercising them, as they can be legitimately exercised only by her, whether directly or by her individual members, as in private, or through an agent, as in her public ministrations, when the minister acts in her name in virtue of her call. She is called to guard the purity of the doctrine and ward off false teachers, which can be done only on the ground of her having the power to call in her own hands. And the ministers are asserted to be hers, which of course implies that she has the right to choose them. But there is still another argument to be offered in confirmation of our position, which we deem it necessary to present, not only because it is of great weight in itself and may serve to banish lingering doubts arising from preconceived opinions, and clear away objections, but also because it has been supposed to countenance the opposite view.

5. That the congregation gives the call is proved, finally, by the practice of the Apostles, as recorded in Scripture. The presentation of the argument chiefly in the words of distinguished authors, will subserve the purpose of showing how the Church teaches at the same time that the Scriptural truth is elucidated. "We should not doubt," says Luther, "that the congregation, which has the Gospel, may and should elect and call the person who is to teach the word in its stead. But thou sayest: St. Paul commanded Timothy and Titus to ordain priests, and in Acts 14: 23 we read that Paul and Barnabas consecrated priests in the congregations; therefore the congregation cannot call any person, nor can any one come forward of himself to preach among Christians, but the permission and commission of the bishops, abbots, or other prelates who sit in the apostles' seat, must be obtained. I reply: If our bishops and abbots, &c., sit in the room of the apostles, as they pretend, it would pass as an opinion that they should be permitted to do what Titus, Timothy,

Paul and Barnabas did in the ordination of priests. But since they sit in the devil's room and are wolves who will not teach nor tolerate the Gospel, the appointment of ministers and pastors concerns them as little as it does the Turks and Jews. They should drive asses and lead dogs." (22: 148.) It is a palpable misconception of Luther's meaning to assert that he, in this passage, admitted the ministerial right of appointing ministers, and denied it in the case of the papists, only because they were not faithful ministers. He merely asserts that an arrangement could be made, if they were faithful, by which the ordination would be left to them, as it has been and should be in the Church, not by necessary divine right, but as a matter of propriety and order, not as a matter of faith but, as he expressly asserts, as an opinion. If this were not certain from the words quoted, it certainly would be from those which follow. He proceeds: "Besides, if even they were true bishops who desired the Gospel, and were willing to ordain true preachers, they could not and should not do this without the congregation's consent, election and call, except where necessity requires it, that souls may not perish for the want of the divine word. For in such necessity, as thou hast heard, not only may every one procure a minister, whether through prayer or the power of the civil government, but may also, if able, hasten forward and teach himself. For necessity is necessity and has no measure, just as every one should rush to the rescue when the city is burning, and not wait until he is requested to help. But where there is no such necessity, and where persons are found who have the right and power and grace to teach, no bishop shall ordain any one without the congregation's election, consent and call, but he shall confirm the person elected and called by the congregation. If he refuses to do this, such person is confirmed at any rate by the congregation's call. For neither Titus, nor Timothy, nor Paul ever appointed a priest without being elected and called by the congregation. This is clearly proved from Tit. 1: 7 and 1 Tim. 5: 2: 'A bishop must be blameless,' and from the command to prove the deacons. Now it is not likely that Titus knew who were blameless, but the report must come from the congregation, who must designate them. Again we read in Acts 6, that the Apostles themselves were not at liberty to appoint persons, even to the much less important office of a deacon without the knowledge and consent of the congregation: but the congregation called the seven deacons and the

Apostles confirmed them. If the Apostles could not by their own authority install officers whose duties referred merely to the distribution of temporal things, how could they have been so bold as by their own authority to confer the highest office, that of preaching, upon any one without the congregation's knowledge, consent, and call?" The celebrated Chemnitz exhibits the truth on this subject, in opposition to the errors of the Tridentine Council, as follows: "Here the question occurs, by whose voice and suffrage this election and vocation must be given in order that it may be considered divine, that is, that God may Himself by these means elect, call and send laborers into His harvest? In respect to this there are certain and manifest examples in Holy Scripture. In Acts 1, when another was to be elected in the place of Judas, Peter proposed the matter not only to the Apostles, but also to the other disciples, as the believers were then called, the number of whom assembled was about one hundred and twenty. And there he showed from the Scriptures what persons and how they were to be elected, and in connection with this prayers were offered. Lots were cast, indeed, because the vocation was not to be simply mediate, but Apostolic, on which account they were not to be used subsequently in merely mediate calls. When, according to Acts 6, deacons are to be elected and called, the Apostles are unwilling to arrogate to themselves alone the power of calling, and therefore call the congregation together. But they do not altogether decline all care for the vocation and leave it to the blind and confused arbitrary will of the people or the multitude, but they are as it were the governors and moderators of the election and call; for they propose the doctrine and rule respecting the persons to be chosen and the manner of choosing them. Those who are elected are placed before the Apostles, that the election may be approved by their judgment as to its validity, and they approve the election by the imposition of hands, while prayers are offered. According to Acts 14 Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in the several congregations which they had evangelized. But they do not assume to themselves alone the right and authority to elect and call; for Luke uses the word *ἐκλογισαμένους*, which, in 2 Cor. 8: 19, is employed to designate an election by the voice or suffrage of the congregation; for it is derived from the custom of the Greeks to give their vote by extending the hand, and signifies the designation of any one by vote, or the manifestation of consent to anything. Paul and Barnabas did not, therefore, impose the elders upon the un-

willing congregations without asking their consent. And when, as recorded in Acts 15, men were to be appointed to bear messages to the church at Antioch, Luke says: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole Church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas." It is important to observe in the apostolic history that sometimes the ministers and the rest of the church, at the same time, proposed and elected the proper persons jointly, as in Acts 1. Sometimes the congregation proposed and elected, but the election was submitted to the apostles for approbation, as in Acts 6. But frequently the apostles, who were better able to judge of these things, proposed to the congregations the persons whom they judged qualified for the ministry, and when the vote and consent of the congregation was given, the call was valid. Thus Paul sends Timothy, Titus, Sylvanus, &c., to the churches. Thus presbyters are proposed in Acts 14, whom the Church approves by their suffrage. Sometimes persons of their own accord offered their services to the Church, 1 Tim. 3: "If a man desires the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." But always in the times of the apostles there was found and required in a legitimate call the consent of the congregation and the judgment and confirmation of the Presbytery. So Titus was left in Crete to lead and direct the election of elders, that it might be properly held, and that he might by ordination approve and confirm the election properly made. For in Titus 1 Paul uses the same word in reference to the appointment of elders which occurs in Acts 14, where mention is made of the election as well as of the ordination of presbyters. And he commands Titus to rebuke those sharply who are not sound in doctrine and do not teach as they should; that is, as he expresses it more clearly in 1 Tim. 5: "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins," namely, by approving an election or vocation which is not properly made." Exam. II, 226. The advocates of the theory which makes the office dependent, not upon the congregation's, but upon the ministers' call, will not find it easy to refute the argument of this celebrated writer from apostolic practice, and it certainly requires no little hardihood on their part to maintain that the leading writers of the Lutheran Church ever countenanced their Romanizing error. The same argument is presented also by Gerhard, who after showing that all orders in the Church must have a voice in the vocation of pastors, which belongs



to the whole Church, not to a mere portion of it, and pointing out what part should be properly assigned to each in giving the call, writes thus: "The general rule, therefore, that pastors are called by the consent of the congregation and that no one is to be imposed upon it against its will, has the express testimony of Scripture and is confirmed by the constant practice of the primitive Church; but the particular form of election varies: for sometimes the votes of the people have been required to nominate persons, sometimes their approbation have been required in cases of persons previously nominated. This is confirmed by the apostolic practice in the election of Matthias, Acts 1: 15; Peter points out what kind of person should be chosen, then v. 23 the congregation appointed two, one of whom, namely, Matthias, when he had been divinely chosen by lot, was elected to the ministry by the common voice of the disciples, v. 26. Although this call of Matthias was an immediate one, yet this suffrage of the believing people, which was added, is rightly applied as an example of mediate vocation. In Acts 6, when deacons were to be appointed, the apostles said to the brethren, that is, the rest of the church: 'Look ye out seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. These then elect Stephen with six others, whom they set before the apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands upon them.' So these deacons were appointed by the vote of the whole Church. According to Acts 14: 23 the apostles ordain elders in their newly organized congregations by collecting the votes *χειροτονήσαντες*. In 1 Cor. 16: 3 we read: 'Whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send.' According to 2 Cor. 8: 19 Titus was chosen of the churches, the congregations approving the choice of Titus by their consent and vote, and approving his person also (*χειροτονηθείς*). In 1 Tim. 3: 7 it is said of a bishop that he must have a good report of them which are without,' how much more of them over whom he is placed. Therefore the judgment of the congregation must be heard respecting the person to be elected to the ministry. And St. Paul says 1 Tim. 5: 22: 'Lay hands suddenly on no man,' that is, not before the testimony and consent of the church is added.' (Loc. 24: §86.) The record furnished of apostolic practice is thus seen to be so far from presenting a difficulty and forming a ground of objection to the Lutheran doctrine, that it affords strong confirmation of its truth.



But the whole purpose of the present section is not yet accomplished by showing that the power of calling to the ministry belongs to the congregation. We have proved that it does lie there. But the Scriptures teach more than this ; the truths exhibited imply that the power not only lies in the congregation, but that it lies nowhere else. This seems to us of sufficient importance to call special attention to it, as it sometimes appears to be considered a matter of indifference whether the call comes from the Church, or from the State, or from that portion of the Church which is called the ministry.

III. The call to the pastoral office can be legitimately given only by the congregation, as the power of calling belongs exclusively to the church, all whose members have equal rights in this regard. Two theories at variance with this truth have been advocated, the one claiming the right and power for the civil government, the other for the incumbents of the ecclesiastical office, to the exclusion of all other members of the church.

1. That the right belongs to the civil authorities is an assertion so utterly gratuitous that much need not be said to refute it. A Scriptural argument to sustain it does not exist, unless the attempt to prove regulations, intended for circumstances and relations under the old dispensation to be normal for all time, should be dignified with such a name. The whole spirit of the New Testament, as well as all its teachings and examples, are so manifestly inconsistent with such a subjection of the Church to the State, that any endeavor, seriously to establish it from the Gospel, would seem like madness. That Church and State are both divine institutions, that they are mutually to respect and aid each other so far as this may be done within the domain of each, and that men's rights as citizens of the State and as members of the Church are equally to be preserved, according to our Lord's will is undeniably true ; but it is just as certain that the two spheres, and the rights and duties pertaining to each, though both are equally divine, must not be confounded. The Church serves the State by furnishing such power to men and inculcating such principles, as will render them quiet and orderly citizens, who will always be willing to give unto Caesar that which is Caesar's ; the State serves the Church by protecting her against the violence of wicked men who, refusing to be directed by the gentle power of the word, which the Church employs, must be coerced by the

rude power of the sword, which God has authorized the State to wield. But neither is subject to the other: they are co-ordinate powers, each with its peculiar mission; and the State can therefore as little appoint the Church's ministers by divine right, as the Church can appoint governors of the State. Either may be done *jure humano*; but neither can be done in virtue of powers, divinely conferred to this end. The State may have an arrangement with the Church by which the latter may nominate the ruler, or consecrate the lawful head of the government: there could be no objection to this on Scriptural grounds, if the arrangement seemed expedient, so long as that, which is freely entered into, is not made compulsory, or represented as essential. It would be the sheerest arrogance for the Church to claim that there could be no legitimate ruler without her voice or benediction. So the Church may have an arrangement with the State by which the latter may be authorized to nominate or appoint pastors. There could be no valid objection to this either, so long as the arrangement were deemed a matter of expediency, into which the parties have voluntarily entered. The Church would thus be merely acting by proxy: the rights which she enjoys would be exercised for her and of course by her consent, by the civil authorities, which of themselves have no power whatever in this respect, and which would be guilty of a most mischievous usurpation, if they presumed to exercise such power in their own name and compelled the Church's submission to it. By such delegated right the power of calling ministers was freely accorded to civil rulers by the Lutheran Church, at various periods in her history; and this fact has often been misinterpreted as though it subordinated the Church to the State. It was a mere expression of her unvarying doctrine, that the Church alone has the priesthood and keys and can therefore alone appoint the ministers to use them: but she is free to make this appointment in the manner which suits her best, whether by the vote of her entire membership, or by the vote of a vestry, or committee, or person, in whom she has vested the right. The words of Luther conclusively prove this, even if such interpretation of the fact were not rendered absolutely necessary by the principles expressed, apart from any direct statement as to how the Church understood it. He says, as we have already quoted the words on p. 14, that pastors are called by the congregation, or by those who have the congregation's con-

mand and consent to do it. This command and consent the civil powers frequently received in Lutheran countries, being called to act in the Church's name. Then the rulers sometimes acted, without any expressed consent, as principal members of the churches, by a kind of necessity, owing to the incompetency of the people, amid the papal darkness, to use their privileges. Thus Hartmann says: "In our days the distinguished piety of our princes is worthy of praise, inasmuch as they appoint capable and worthy teachers for their subjects, not that the congregations might be deprived of their rights; but because the people neither understood nor exercised their right, and their judgment was clouded by ancient errors, the rulers took them under their guardianship and acted instead of the Church." Past. 76, (as quoted by Walther, &c. 314.) Whatever may be said of the rights of the state in things sacred, it is certain that according to the Lutheran doctrine the consent of the congregation, even though sometimes, in cases of necessity, it should be mere silent consent, was always, and must always be, deemed necessary for the appointment of pastors, because believers, not civil rulers as such, alone have the keys. If theories have been broached and laws been enacted which are inconsistent with this, it must be apparent to those who have carefully considered the subject and examined the evidence, that they are just as little Lutheran as they are scriptural.

2. The other theory, that the ministry is an order which propagates itself, and that accordingly ministers are called to the office not by the Church, but by those who themselves hold the office, has not only more advocates, but has also more semblance of reason for it. But it is equally false, and can be proved to be so on scriptural grounds with equal certainty. For that all Christians are one in Christ and have, therefore, an equal share in the believers' privileges, that they all belong to the Lord's body and have equal share in the treasures which the Lord has been pleased to confer upon His bride, that they all possess the priesthood and the keys in common, has been proved from the Lord's infallible word. This in itself clearly evinces that every attempt to prove a doctrine which is inconsistent with these equal rights must be a failure. But the proofs adduced bear their weakness on their face. They would be inconclusive in any case; they are little less than an insult to the understanding when it is seen that they are brought forward to subvert precious Chris-

man privileges which are divinely guaranteed. Thus it is argued that, because Jesus sent His disciples as He was sent Himself, they must necessarily have the power of calling others to the office as He had it. But the Scriptures nowhere affirm that the ministers become equal with Christ because He has called them to a holy office; It is almost blasphemous to base equality with Christ, in all things upon the similarity of commission to preach the gospel between Him and His apostles. But if equality in all things is not intended to be maintained, by what right is equal power in commissioning ministers claimed? The question is, in what respect is their commission like Christ's? and the proof is positive that it is *not* in respect to the right of commissioning others again. Further, the argument has been harped upon from the days of Bellarmine down to the present, until it has seemed as though it were the only one in which the advocates of this hierarchical system had themselves any confidence, that it contravenes all equity and propriety to maintain the authority of the sheep to elect their own shepherd. That the members of the congregation are called sheep, the congregation a flock, the ministers pastors, we all know. But it provokes a smile when strong men forthwith conclude that ministers must alone have the power of appointing ministers, because sheep cannot be presumed to have discernment enough to make choice of a shepherd. Now, this is all very well when we are speaking of literal sheep: they manifestly have not the rational powers necessary to select a proper shepherd over themselves: such shepherd must be appointed by those who are of the same species with him, namely, by human beings. But it is an insult of the greatest magnitude to say that Christians are all mere irrational brutes, with the exception of the ministers, and can therefore not be expected to have sense enough to make choice of a pastor, whose appointment must be left to those of the same species with himself. And yet this is precisely what the argument implies: it is of no force whatever, unless this be admitted. For if we assume that the shepherd is himself one of the flock, what objection can there then be to his being chosen by his peers? If there is an utter impropriety in the appointment of the shepherds by the sheep, how could the ministers themselves make the appointment, if they themselves are sheep of the Lord's fold also? The whole argumentation is preposterous. The flock is not one of brutes, but of rational creatures, whose wants the Lord

supplies, and who is, in this respect, called their shepherd : In His name others are chosen to administer the means of His appointment and thus bear to His people the spiritual food which He prepares, and these persons are, in this respect, called the shepherds. Now, if there is any inconsistency or impropriety in maintaining the right of the people to select one from their own number to administer this office, seeing they all have the same dignity and the same character as Christians, it must require a special revelation to see it. The impropriety is precisely the same as it is in the case of an appointment to any office by an election, that is, it has no existence at all. Finally, when an argument is drawn from the practice of the apostles to prove the divine right of the ministry to appoint ministers, we need only refer to what has been said on this point above to prove its fallaciousness. It is false in its assumption of facts and its inferences from them. The facts in the case are that the apostles ordained men to the ministry, who were designated for the office and called by the congregation's vote, as this is conclusively proved in the extracts from Chemnitz and Gerhard. And if even the facts were otherwise, if even it could be shown conclusively that the apostles did send forth ministers without the consent or call of the congregations, it would not follow from this, that the power of appointing the pastors is lodged not in the people but in the pastors themselves. For it must be observed, in the first place, that the whole world was then missionary ground, and that missionaries, whose business it is to plant churches, not to be pastors of already collected flocks, need no other call than that which they have as believers and lovers of souls, which entitles them all to speak about Christ to the heathen around them. If, then, the apostles did send out preachers to evangelize cities and provinces, they did just what any pastor may do just as well, according to the Lutheran faith as according to the Romish theory, nay, they did just what any layman may do ; and the persons thus sent had just the same rights where there were no existing congregations as they would have had, if sent by laymen, or if they had gone without any other commission than that which all have from the Lord in faith and charity. And it must be observed also, in the second place, that the relation of the apostles to the existing congregations was different from that of pastors in established churches. Their field was the world ; there were no parochial limits, within which their vocation was to be exercised. The diffu-



sion of Christianity throughout the world, not merely the preservation and edification of churches previously founded, being the object of their mission, their activity could not be limited to a narrow field, as is that of ordinary pastors. If, then, they did send persons to minister to congregations which they had gathered, they did only what Lutheran pastors may do now, without in the least conflicting with the Lutheran doctrine, as we have presented it. They sent vicars to act as their substitutes, in their own field and upon their responsibility, just as a pastor may have another to officiate for him in his own congregation, he bearing the responsibility, although this could not be long continued without the congregation's consent. But such a wide range ministers have not now; the world is not every pastor's field, but only that portion of it to which he is called, and in that limited parish he has just the same authority as the apostles in theirs, deducting that which grows out of the infallibility of these inspired men. If such exceptional cases of apostolic appointment to pastoral duties did occur, they do not, therefore, conflict with the rule that the congregation gives the call; nothing more than a fair consideration of the extraordinary times and circumstances, in which the apostles lived and labored would be necessary to show the consistency of such cases with its requirements. Such are the arguments which are brought forward to prove the ministry to be an independent, self-propagating order, in opposition to the doctrine of our Church which affirms it to be appointed by the Church. A score of such could not create the slightest presumption against a truth as plain as this, that the priesthood and keys belong to the Church, and must therefore be administered by her authority, especially as this conclusion is confirmed by numerous precepts and examples of the Scriptures. The arrogance of ministers and ministerial bodies therefore deserves nothing but condemnation, when they usurp all power and authority in this respect, as is frequently done, we grieve to say, even by those who love to bear the Lutheran name. In many instances the congregations are not even allowed the right of veto, much less that of election. True, in most cases they are permitted to vote upon the question whether this or that person shall be their pastor; they can elect him or reject him, so far as their particular, parish is concerned. But ministers often without asking any congregation whether they want him, and even in spite of their declaration that they do not want him, ordain a person, and

make him and themselves ridiculous by styling him a pastor, even if nobody wants him. The congregation's veto is not admitted to have any force in regard to the ministerial call, but only, at best, in regard to the right of exercising the ministry, already received in any particular locality. People can quietly endure such gross wrong, only while they are kept in ignorance of their rights; where they are conscious of their Christian prerogatives they must indignantly protest against such usurpation, as we do here. Not that the call is to be given altogether independently of ministers and Ministeriums. Christian men who contend for Christian rights, will be least inclined to trample on the rights of the ministers, whose rights and privileges are of course not less than those of any other Christian. Where a parish has already a minister and desires to call another, it would be just as sinful to do so without hearing the voice of the pastor, as it is for a Ministerium to make pastors without people. And in any case it is proper for the congregation to procure the assistance of ministers, if this is possible, in the appointment of pastors; first, because they usually are best able to conduct the examination with regard to the candidate's qualifications; secondly, because the reverence which is due to God's ambassadors to men requires this; and thirdly, because it is meet that the public ceremonies which are proper on such occasions should be conducted by those who already hold the office. So the appointment of ministers may be delegated to a Ministerium or Synod by the congregation recognizing it, and may thus be attended to in their name, just as such authority may be given to the civil government, and precisely in the same way. No wrong could be found in such an arrangement, freely entered into for the sake of expediency. But when a body to which rights were delegated, to be used in the name of their proprietors, usurped them as their own and deny the owner's title to them, it is very questionable expediency to entrust them longer in such hands. An outrage is then committed which faith alone cannot endure. In any case the power can be in their hands only by consent of the congregation to which it originally belongs: the proof of this from the Scriptures and the Symbols has been abundantly furnished; and the call is thus given through the congregation, whether the power of conferring it is used mediately or immediately.

§3. *The Call is given by a particular parish and is confined to its limits.*

The notion that a minister is such absolutely, whether he has a parish or not, and that he accordingly has peculiar powers, which no other person has, beyond as well as within the limits of his parish, if he happens to have any, finds not the slightest encouragement among Lutheran writers of note, as it has not the slightest foundation in Scripture. The doctrine taught by the Bible and by the Church is, that the pastor's peculiar calling extends no further than the congregation which has called him, and beyond this he has no more rights than any other Christian. This we proceed to prove.

1. That the call is limited to the parish, extending the call, is evident from the nature of the ministry. The pastor is not a lord over the flock, but an agent of the people of God. Where there is no church there can, in the nature of the case, be no pastor; for, although there may be a missionary purposing and laboring to gather a flock, yet he cannot possibly do this as a minister of the congregation, which does not yet exist, or of the people of God who are yet to come into being. Whatever ceremonies may be performed by way of sending missionaries to places in which congregations of Christians have not yet been formed, and whatever names may be applied to the persons thus sent, it remains an undeniable fact that among the unbelievers they are not pastors, but simply Christians, and do whatever they can to evangelize the people in virtue of their royal priesthood, not in virtue of any peculiar powers which they possess above other Christians. There is not the shadow of a proof that not every Christian, ordained or not, has a perfect right to make as many disciples as he can among the heathen. On heathen ground there can in reality be no distinction between pastor and people, for the very simple reason that a Christian people does not exist there. But it may be answered that a person can be appointed pastor in general, to whom a particular flock may be subsequently assigned. We see the same congruity in this as in the appointment of any other officer, who has no place and no power to exercise the office. It is ridiculous to speak of appointing a President or Governor who has nothing, over which to preside or govern. One may be found qualified for a Presidency and designated and recommended for the office, but he will remain a candidate for it, not an actual president, until he is chosen by the proper authorities; and the proper authorities are the people to be governed, not the assembly of Presidents or Governors

already existing, unless these are requested to do it in the name of the people who have the power. So the recommendation of a person to the pastoral office by persons who are qualified to judge, and his designation and benediction, if persons see fit to give this in such cases amid public ceremony, can present him as a proper candidate for the pastoral office, but cannot render him a pastor, which requires the election of those, whose pastor he would be. A king without a country and a pastor without a congregation are among the absurdities, in which people will sometimes fall. Upon no other ground than the popish one, that the ministry is not a mere office, but an order of superior holiness, the members of which are made recipients of some indescribable something by the sacrament of ordination, which impresses an indelible character on them, can any rational claim be built of a ministry without a parish; for only upon such ground can a man be a minister, even though not an individual, much less a congregation, should desire any ministrations at his hands. But a congregation cannot appoint ministers for another congregation: each has the right of electing its own. If the congregation extends a call to a person, it of course means that the call is confined to that congregation, and no sane person understands it otherwise. If the call comes from a Synod, or committee, or Ministerium, it comes on behalf of some congregation for whom such body is agent, and then the recipient of the call is again aware of his special field, and thinks of no other; or the call is of no force and validity whatever, giving no rights and conferring no privileges. Or what rights and privileges are conferred? Where does a person receive a right to officiate? Where there is no congregation? There all have the same rights without a call. Where there is a congregation? There he has no rights whatever, until he receives a call. The congregation's call gives him, who previously had a right to officiate nowhere publicly in the church, a right to officiate within its limits as their pastor, and, as one congregation cannot be lord over another, it gives him a right nowhere else. If he legitimately performs pastoral functions anywhere else publicly in the church, it must be after being called by the congregation, or being requested by the duly called pastor to officiate as his vicar in his name and stead. No other theory could be brought into harmony with the words of our Symbols, "That God has given the keys not to several particular persons, but to the whole Church," and that "the Church is

above her ministers;" for if a person could be pastor independently of the congregation or congregations, he must necessarily be in possession of the keys without receiving them from the church, and it would then not be true that God gave them not to particular persons, but to the whole church; and if the keys belong to the persons whom no church has called, but whom some members of the church are pleased to denominate pastors, so that the congregation is rather dependent on the ministry, than this on the congregation, for the use of the keys, it would follow that the ministers are superior to their churches rather than, as the Confessions affirm, that the church is superior to her ministers. The steward's rights and duties are confined to the house, of which he has been appointed steward, and extends not to those, the stewardship of which has been given to others.

2. That the pastor's office is limited to his parish is evident also from passages of Scripture bearing more directly on the question. St. Paul says: "So have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." Rom. 15: 20. This gives a reason for such limitation. The work to be done requires economy of powers. Where one is laboring, another must not exercise his gifts and energies, unless there is need for more than one. There are places enough where labor is necessary: we must not squander it in places where it is unnecessary. Besides, when we labor in a place pre-occupied by another we not only needlessly waste strength, but we at the same time encroach upon another's domain. What the apostle was constrained to guard against, namely, building on another man's foundation, we have the same, if not greater, reason for shunning. The same apostle, in opposition to the false apostles who gloried in themselves and reaped where they had never sown, declares in another place: "We are come as far as to you also in preaching the Gospel of Christ: not boasting of things without our measure, that is, of other men's labors: but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you, according to our rule abundantly, to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond you, and not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand." 2 Cor. 10: 14-16. Now, if they, who had a so much more extensive call than we, whose field was the world, as no minister's is now, deemed it wrong for themselves to labor in fields which others had been culti-



vating before, and thus appropriate to themselves honor which belongs to others, how deeply sinful should it not appear in our sight, if careless men should presume to break into parishes to which they are not called, and to do this especially in spite of another's protests, who is called ! But if a person who has received a regular call from one place is thus earnestly prohibited from officiating in the bounds of another, just as much so as the person who has no vocation to the office, the call must, of course, confine the office to the congregation by which it was given. The person who has no such call to a particular parish has not the office ; the person who has the office has a parish. This is evinced by the examples, presented in the sacred records. All the ministers of whom we there read, except the Apostles and those who were employed by them as vicars, were ministers of special congregations, not of the whole Church in general. That the Apostles were not limited to any particular place we grant ; it was one of the peculiarities of their office, as distinguished from the ordinary ministry, that they had the world for their field. We therefore do not deny that they were a kind of universal bishops and general superintendants as well as preachers of the gospel in the ordinary sense. The unlimited field of labor was extraordinary in the apostolate, and as such is not to be predicated of the ordinary ministry. We have no Apostles now ; least of all, would we suppose those who have no parishes to be such, even if we admitted that the particular office with all its powers remained. But it did not so remain. The Apostles were the first ministers, and as such their office, which is the ordinary ministry, has continued until this day and will continue to the end. The administration of the means of grace for the saving of souls was their great work, as it is that of the ministry always. In addition to this they had prerogatives belonging to them as extraordinary ministers. They were inspired and, therefore, infallible in doctrine ; they were endowed with the power of working miracles ; and, as already stated, had an unbounded field of labor. But in the latter, as in the two other respects, the ordinary ministers differ from them. And the example of the successors of the Apostles, rather than of these themselves, must be deemed normal for us, for the plain reason that our ministers are not Apostles, but their successors. Now, the examples recorded of such ordinary teachers after the Apostles show that each had his proper parish and definite place assigned him, being

called and limited to that. Thus it is said Acts 14, 23: "When they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord." It has been shown, that the word translated "ordained" means to appoint by vote. These elders were elected in the churches under the supervision of the Apostles: they were regularly called by the congregations, whose ministers they were to be. Each one had his charge; each church had its minister. The words cannot be fairly interpreted to mean anything else: every church had its elder. This is confirmed by Acts 20, 28: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." The pastor has his flock to attend to: for this he is to render an account; among them he has solemn duties to perform and precious privileges to exercise; but beyond this fold he has neither the right to officiate nor the responsibility to sustain. When a man is a minister he necessarily has a flock to lead and consequent rights and responsibilities; the minister is a minister not of the whole world, nor of all the churches in the world, but of the Church which has called him to the office. And when people speak of one's being a minister, even though he have no flock, we cannot but insist that they must either suppose the minister to be made the subject of some ineffable something, which elevates him personally above other christians, though he exercise no ministerial functions whatever and have, in fact, no right to do so, seeing he has no vocation, or they must confound the qualifications for the office which may have been found in a person, with the office itself, being guilty of the same absurdity as those who, having found in a person the requisite qualities to make a good ruler, declare him to be a Mayor to whom nothing is wanting but a city: a Mayor in general, until he is called to some particular city by the people's vote.

3. Of such errors and incongruities our fathers were never guilty. They taught the limitation of pastoral functions to the parish by which the call was given, and knew of no office or right to officiate, apart from such call. We shall give some extracts from writers of the highest authority in the Church to establish this, as evidence that the scriptural doctrine which we have exhibited is the Lutheran doctrine also. Dr. Luther speaks thus upon the subject: "If Münzer, Carlstadt and company had not been permitted to sneak and

creep into other's houses and parishes, whither nobody sent them and for which they had no commission, all this great trouble would have been averted. That the apostles also went to other's houses and preached, is true; they were commanded to do so, and were appointed, called and sent to preach the Gospel everywhere, as Christ said: Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature: but afterwards no one received such common apostolical command: on the contrary, every bishop or pastor has his particular district or parish, which St. Peter therefore calls *κληρος*, that is, portion, because to each one is assigned his portion of people, as St. Paul also says to Titus." (39, 254.) This doctrine, which is here so deliberately expressed, is often presented incidentally in his writings, as no other would be at all in harmony with his doctrine of the ministerial office. He also speaks of the distinction between the priesthood which belongs to all Christians, and the pastorate, which only those have who are called, and makes use of this expression: "In addition to this that he is a Christian and priest he must have an office and an appointed parish." The special parish is thus represented as essential to the minister: "It is one of the requisites to distinguish a pastor from a common priest, i. e. believer. So again, in a letter to Dorothea Joerger, he says: "Whoever is called is consecrated, and shall speak to those who called him: this is the consecration of our Lord God, and is the true chrism." (55, 105.) In Luther's view the call from those, whose minister a person is to be, is necessary, and nothing beyond this, however great might be the utility of other things, usually connected with the appointment of ministers, as ordination, &c. With this the expressed convictions of others of the most celebrated writers in the church coincide. Chemnitz writes: "What we have above said concerning the vocations of the apostles, that it extended itself over the whole earth, we are not able to affirm of those who are immediately called. For doctors, pastors, bishops, presbyters are called to certain congregations, and have not absolute power to teach everywhere or in all churches. So according to Acts 14, 22 elders are appointed in every church, and in Tit. 1, 5 we are informed that Titus was left in Crete, that he might ordain elders in every city. And thus the Lord is accustomed to show each one, by a special vocation, where He desires him to use his gifts; and this vocation gives no authority to teach in other congregations which have given no call. Hence in the coun-

cil of Chalcedon, (held A. D. 451) it was determined that no one should be absolutely ordained, that is, not until he is called to a certain and special congregation." (Loc. P. III, p. 136-7.) And Gerhard says substantially the same in various places. "The ministry of the apostles," he remarks was not limited to a certain place, but to them the command and authority was given of preaching everywhere. Matt. 28, 19; Mark 16, 15. But the ministry of those who succeeded and now succeed the apostles in the office of teaching, is confined to a certain place. Acts 14, 23 presbyters are ordained in every city; Acts 20, 28 the ministers of the Ephesian Church are said to be constituted bishops of a certain flock by the Holy Spirit; Tit. 1, 5 Titus was left in Crete to ordain elders in every city; and 1 Pet. 5, 2 it is said: "Feed the flock of God which is among you; that is, the flock which is committed to your care and fidelity." (Loc. 24, §220.) According to these authorities there can be no universal bishops now, such as the apostles were, but only ministers of congregations; and the pretended appointment of men to the office, who have no call to a parish, is an idle ceremony, which gives them not a particle of power or authority. A valid call, which renders a man a pastor, renders him the pastor of those, by whom he is called, and of no others.

§4. *The call is not given for a definite period, but is unlimited in regard to time.*

The limitations which the scriptures affix to the pastoral office in regard to place are not applicable in regard to time. The pastor has his particular parish, but he has no limited time, during which he is to officiate. The office is conferred without any reference to time; its duration will be determined by circumstances. A call for a stated period would ill accord with the nature and the objects of the office. To prove this, and to point out the legitimate consequence of it, is the design of the present section.

I. It might be supposed, that there is no necessity for the presentation of evidence to establish our proposition, as few, if any, deny it, especially as it is not easy, and usually not required, to prove a negative. But evident as the truth stated appears in itself, and general as may be the assent to it in theory, it is still frequently denied in practice, which indicates, that it is not fully admitted in all its consequences, but it should be, because

I. The Scriptures teach that the office is conferred for an



indefinite time, as it prescribes no limits in precept or in example. All the ministers, of whom mention is made, were so permanently. The ministry everywhere meets us as a vocation for life. Not only do we not read of any who were appointed for a limited time, but we do read of a number who continued their ministerial labors until death, and the legitimate inference is, that they were appointed to the office during life or for an unlimited time. And the language which is used in scripture in reference to the officers of the Church frequently implies the permanence of their appointment. For example, St. Peter addresses the elders thus: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Pet, 5, 2-4. This manifestly pre-supposes that they should retain their office and be faithful in the discharge of its duties while they live, or until the crown of glory should be given them in heaven. Again, St. Paul says to Timothy: "Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry. For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness." The apostle remained a laborer in the ministry until his departure, and Timothy is also by implication exhorted to labor faithfully until death, making full proof of the ministry. Of the elders and bishops who were ordinary pastors in particular congregations, there is no account given from which we could learn how long they remained in their office; but in the absence of direct proof the presumption of their permanence, furnished by the cases of ministerial service during life which we have, must be sufficient to convince all reasonable persons. And this especially when it is considered that,

2. Reason teaches that the call should not be limited in time. For, in a matter so momentous, it is scarcely to be expected that congregations will be so reckless as to act before they are convinced of the candidate's qualifications. But if they are convinced of this, there is no reason why the appointment should not be made absolutely as regards time, since there certainly is no limit, beyond which a pastor's services will not be necessary; on the other hand there is rea-



son for desiring their indefinite continuance. For experience only increases the qualifications for the ministry and supplies the skill to render it more successful. The first years of a faithful minister's labors are usually those in which least has been accomplished, although appearances would sometimes indicate the reverse. The more extensive the knowledge acquired in process of time, and the experience gained in the life within and without, as well as the increased ability to use successfully the treasures acquired, generally render the pastor more able. In view of this it would be a mistaken policy to choose the minister only for a limited time, and leave him, after the expiration of this, to assume his place again among the hearers. And it would not be rendered much better if the design were to re-appoint him at the end of his term in case he continued acceptable. Indeed, it is a question, whether this does not make the matter worse. For, in the first place, it is the expression of some lingering doubt or suspicion as to the pastor's fitness for the office; and the election without confidence can only be pronounced sinful; or it is the manifestation of that wanton spirit which desires a preacher merely for excitement and amusement, not for the means of grace unto salvation, and which, therefore, seeks to be free from any obligation to retain a pastor longer than he can satisfy their carnal requirements. And, in the second place, if even a pure motive could exist, the arrangement would prove injurious to congregations on account of the opportunity presented of giving vent to those prejudices which will always exist, and the influence of which at elections tends to disturb the church's harmony. It is, therefore, wrong to give calls to the ministry for a limited time. It does not, indeed, render the call itself invalid; but it is so directly against all scriptural usage and enlightened reason, and so generally based on sinful ground, that a congregation could rarely give, or a minister accept such a call without sin. That the call may terminate before death, is readily admitted. For

II. The legitimate consequence of our doctrine is not that the call is absolutely for life and cannot, under any circumstances, cease to be of binding force, but it is, that the call cannot usually expire by previous limitation, and must, therefore, be abrogated, if at all, on grounds which were not seen to exist at the time it was given.

1. The call is not of such a character that it cannot be revoked or abrogated under any circumstances. This would be a necessary consequence, if it were maintained that it is given absolutely for life. But such is not the case. There is no limit fixed, at the time it is extended; but this does not prevent its limitation by Providence or man's folly. Divine Providence may render a severance of the pastoral relation desirable, by a visitation which disables the minister, but which does not incapacitate him for some other pursuit; and under such circumstances it is evident that the resignation of the office is a plain duty, that the former pastor may engage without encumbrance in some other employment. The call has then no more binding force than if had never been given. Human folly may also be instrumental in terminating the call, and this in a two-fold manner: first, by misjudging the pastor, and secondly, by misleading the people. The pastor is required to be sound in faith and blameless in morals. The call is given upon evidence furnished, that the candidate has these qualifications in addition to the necessary physical and intellectual powers; that is, the call is so given where the Scriptures are followed. But the called person may become unsound in the faith, or immoral in his life, or may even have been so previously, and concealed the sin. In either case the call terminates, not of course by limitation to a specific time, but by a breach of essential conditions, and the congregation, which would comply with the divine word, must revoke it immediately. On the other hand the congregation may become, or prove to be one whose minister the called person cannot conscientiously be. The people may refuse to endure sound doctrine, and, in spite of all their pastor's warnings and entreaties, adopt a false Confession. He would have no other choice, in such a wretched case, but to shake the dust from his feet and depart thence. But while the call may be terminated by circumstances, and is thus not necessarily obligatory for life,

2. It is a legitimate consequence of our proposition, that the pastoral relation cannot be arbitrarily severed, at any time, by either party. Excepting in those cases in which the one is bound to reject and condemn the other for false doctrine or life, and therefore to revoke or resign the call, mutual consent is required to abrogate it. The pastor has no right to depart from his people whenever his fancy prompts him, and just as little has the congregation a right to depose and dismiss him according to their whim. The

vocation to perform solemn duties cannot be cast off so easily; it may be man's pleasure to flee from the awful responsibility rather than to labor and pray, trusting in the grace of God for ability to bear it, and be faithful; but man's flight cannot compel God's permission, as it does not necessarily pre-suppose it. The vocation, though it came through the congregation, is divine; and a divine call, especially to an office so important, cannot be nullified by a human notion. If we would be released from it, we must ask release from Him who gave it, and seek it through precisely the same channel through which it was given. The congregation calls in the Lord's name; if circumstances come, in which the call should be revoked, the congregation must revoke it in the Lord's name. There may be occasions on which a pastor, who finds no cause which necessitates the relinquishment of his present field, may desire to be released from his obligations to the congregation. Nor need this desire be in conflict with his duty. Another charge may have called him to take upon himself the duties of the office there. There may be cogent reasons for his being convinced that the change would be an advantage to the Church: that it would be a gain for at least one of the congregations, if not for both. But this conviction by no means abrogates the call, which his present charge has given him. If it is God's will that the change should be made, there is no necessity for a departure from God's order to make it; the congregation which extended the call will be made willing to take it back when, under such circumstances, it again is resigned into their hands. Ministers sometimes deceive themselves by assuming it to be the divine will, that they should accede to this or that vocation. The call which they have is binding first of all, and from the obligations which it imposes they must be released first, before they are free to accept any other; and it is safest to abide by the decision of the brethren in reference to a second call, even apart from the imperative duty of compliance with the requirements of the call, previously given, until released by the party giving it. It is amazing with what levity ministers sometimes treat their vocation and with what facility some will sever the relation which God has formed. It is not a rare thing that they practically treat a new call as divine, but the old one, under which they had thus far labored, as merely human; for they feel bound by the new, but not by the old. We cannot conceive how any

new call can be supposed to be binding as long as the former one remains in force ; and in force of course it remains, not only until it is resigned into the hands of those who gave it, but also until these have accepted such resignation. When this is done the minister is released from all obligations ; the divine order is satisfied ; and human right is observed. The conscience is at peace, and the pastor enters upon his new field with a light heart, not burdened by the fear that he may have fled from God when he changed his location, or that he may be performing duties in one place which, by a previous call, he owes to another. But just as the fact that the call is given for an indefinite time requires, that the minister must not, while he can conscientiously remain, change his present relations without the consent of those who called him, so it requires, on the other hand, that the congregation should make no change in their relation to the pastor, without his consent. They have given him a call, and they are bound to comply with its stipulations as well as he who is called. And just as the departure of a minister without further notice, or the submission of his resignation to the people for their acceptance, does not release the minister from his obligations to the flock, unless they accept the resignation laid before them, so the deposal of the pastor by the congregation and the election of another without further notice, or the submission to him of a request or demand to return the call, does not release the congregation from any obligations imposed on them by the terms of such vocation, unless he complies with their request and returns it. They may depose him for false doctrine or immoral conduct, and the call is annulled by this act ; so the minister may reject them for their unscriptural Confession in word or practice, and the call is again abrogated. But they cannot depose him, nor he condemn or reject them without scriptural grounds, and still justly claim their acts to be legitimate.

It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the call cannot be limited by any body aside from the congregation whence it emanates, as it cannot be, by the congregation itself. This truth is often practically controverted. There are persons of ability, nay, whole synods which claim the right, and practice it, of limiting calls, which the congregations have left unlimited. A flock calls a pastor, exercising a right which God has given and which man cannot destroy. The *Ministerium*, with which the flock is in some way connected through its pastor, approves the call and gives its benediction. But the newly

called pastor is seen to be a young man, or, if not young, is at least inexperienced in the ministry, or is supposed to be. Therefore the *Ministerium*, usurping rights which cannot have been conferred in such a case by their proprietors, because these have already acted in the premises and acted differently, resolves to sanction the call, with a limitation to one year. It is not of importance for our present purpose to show that there is no good reason for this, as it is reckless to approve the vocation of one whose qualifications are doubtful, and unjust to withhold approbation if they are not so; that it is a contradiction to speak of a candidate for the office who already has the office, and is licensed to administer it even by those who call him a candidate; that if a distinction is made between pastors of unlimited and those of limited calls, such distinction is unwarranted according to the doctrine of ministerial parity, always held by our Church, and cannot fail to be injurious; but this we would have carefully observed, that if a *Ministerium* limits a call, given by a charge, it not only does that which we have proved to be wrong in itself, but it does so under circumstances, which render it intolerable. For it not only virtually denies the people's right to call, but it refuses even to accord to them the permission as a matter of courtesy, inasmuch as the call given is revised and materially changed by limiting it in time, and rendered unscriptural beside. The adherence to the scriptural rule of permanence in the ministry, while it will guard against the abuses, to which reference has been made, will secure for ministerial labors the greatest possible success by affording the greatest possible advantages.



## ARTICLE II.

### THE OBJECT OF LIFE.\*

By THOMAS H. STOCKTON, D. D., Philadelphia.

WHAT is the object of life? I answer—to do good. By the promptness and positiveness of this reply, I desire to intimate the certainty and exclusiveness of its truth. In

\*Many of our readers will recognize, in the following article, the Address, delivered by the author before the Literary Societies of Pennsylvania College, at the Annual Commencement, Sept. 19th, 1844.



the assertion of such truth, neither doubt nor reservation can be tolerated a moment. As surely as life has an object, that object is, to do good. The subject admits but two theories: one, of Selfishness—the other, of Benevolence. In all essentials, these are opposite and hostile. It is impossible to reconcile them. The difference between them is as great, and as incapable of reduction, as that between a point and infinity. Persons may change; but principles cannot. The concord of Christ and Belial might be imagined, if it could not be believed; but even imagination cannot harmonize truth and error. The restoration of peace between God and the Devil might be supposed, however improper it would be to entertain such a supposition; but good and evil, which are modifications of the same terms, must be utterly abandoned to unavoidable and external separateness and conflict.

The two theories may be thus generally and briefly contrasted: that of selfishness is natural—that of Benevolence, supernatural; the former, a matter of reason—the latter, of revelation; the former false—the latter, true; the former, infidel—the latter faithful; the former, demoniac—the latter, Divine; the former, destructive—the latter redeeming; the former is reprobate, and doomed to oblivion—but the latter is elect, and predestinated to the glory and ecstasy of universal and perpetual triumph and praise.

But let us submit them, successively, to special consideration:

#### I. THE THEORY OF SELFISHNESS.

What is the theory of Selfishness? Its cardinal and controlling doctrine is this: that Life, in its nature and relations, is now, just as it seems, all it ever was, or will be. This is a great principle; comprehensive as the globe, and varied and minute as its inhabitants and interests. From this doctrine proceeds, immediately and efficiently, this distinguishing precept: that it becomes every man to make the most of life, just as he finds it, according to his own will and pleasure, irrespectively of his neighbor's welfare in this world, or his own in any other.

Now, what is Life—according to this theory? I tell you, in advance, it is something which I am happy to despise. Rather, were the theory true, or could I believe it true, life is something I should be proud to despise. Hitherto, I have had no use for this haughty phrase. As a matter of taste.

and of duty. I have shunned it longer than I can remember. It is not a fit word for a Christian. But here, though even here only hypothetically, I am at liberty to use it. And I avail myself of this liberty with a keen gladness; for, there is no other word which could half so well express the lofty scorn I pour through the sentiment—if life were no more than this theory assumes, I would be proud to despise it. To understand the assumption, we must contemplate man himself and the sphere in which he dwells.

Preliminary to this exercise, however, it is well to remark, that the two great doctrinal and practical characteristics of the theory, as already presented, cannot be stated, without the obvious implication of an undesirable condition of things—something, in life and its connexions—something, in the acknowledged necessity to make an effort to derive from it whatever enjoyment its circumstances will allow—not as we would have it, if we held the power to change it. The theory does not assert perfection, of either nature or relation; does not enjoin the pursuit of absolute felicity; but merely teaches, that our present estate, however imperfect, is all we can expect, and, therefore, as, among its many sorrows, some joys may be found, that it is our first and last duty to seek and secure them.

There are two other discriminations, which it is of the utmost importance to premise. They are verbal, yet substantial and thorough; determining the course and form of the whole investigation.

The first, relates to the difference between constitution and condition. By the term constitution, whether applied to a person or thing, I include all the particulars which are essential to its perfect existence. By condition, I embrace all the non-essential circumstances and influences, in which the constitution may be variously involved, and by which its manifestations may be modified, but which cannot destroy its inherent faculties. The human constitution is one thing; its condition, another. The constitution of the earth is one thing; its condition, another. The constitution never changes; the condition is always changing. The constitution of the earth may be regarded as settled; but history and prophecy assure us, that the contingencies of its condition comprehend the deluge and the conflagration—the silent dreariness of a lifeless desert, and the smooth and glowing paradise, blushing with the modesty of universal beauty, and pulsating with the sympathies of universal love. The con-

stitution of man must be regarded as fixed ; but the alternatives of his condition ascend to the sublimest heaven and plunge to the profoundest hell.

The second, relates to the difference between the ideal and the real. By the ideal, as applied to a person or thing, I mean, the mental contemplation of its constitutional perfections and conditional felicities. By the real, I mean the actual constitutional and conditional development ; whether perfect and felicitous, or, imperfect and sorrowful. The ideal man is one thing ; the real, another. The ideal earth is one thing ; the real, another. In both cases, the ideal is perfect ; the real, imperfect. The ideal, as perfect, is one ; but the real, as imperfect, is manifold. Some men seem to be nearly perfect ; and others, mere conglomerations of all imperfection. Some parts of the earth may be described as heavenly ; while others are parched and desolate as perdition. So various are the degrees of imperfection—the diversities of the real. Not that it is necessary the ideal and real should thus differ—but, that they do differ.

These preliminaries arranged, we may now glance at the nature and relations of humanity, that so we may rightly respond to the inquiry—What is life, according to the theory of Selfishness ?

First, Man, himself—what is he ?

What is our physical constitution ? What is the ideal of it ? It is a wonderful ideal. It is more than the mere artist could make it. It is more than the mere anatomist, or physiologist, could make it. And yet, like theirs, only blending their advantages, it is composed of the choicest facts of observation, the most careful deductions of philosophy, and the fairest embellishments of fancy. So far as this world is concerned, it certainly presents an incomparable instrumentality. For the combination of complexity and simplicity in structure ; for separate, concentrate, and honorable variety of uses ; for symmetry of outline ; for delicacy of investiture ; for beauty of complexion ; for meaning of countenance ; for dignity of port ; for grace of motion ; for everything tending to the consummation of unapproachable superiority—there is no such physical organism in any department of nature which is open to our inspection.

But, what is our condition in this respect ? How does the real compare with the ideal ? If we select some noble specimen, as illustrative of their occasional similarity—such a specimen, for instance, as the flatterers of the imperial al-

ways celebrated, as distinctive of Nicholas, the late Russian Autocrat—what have we, but a splendid subject for multiplied and destructive experiments? What though it teems with the most exquisite susceptibilities, myriadly sympathetic to every influence from within and without? What though a ripe grape cannot be pressed upon the lip, nor a breeze blow, nor a flower be shaken, nor a bird sing, nor a star shine, nothing, however slight or remote, make its gentle appeal to its appropriate sense, without exciting the quick thrill of grateful pleasure? Is it not equally responsive to every element and motion of pain? Is there a point, in its whole extension, where some fine nerve is not exposed to sudden and sharp distress? May not violence find revenge—wherever it strikes? And what thousand-eyed vigilance is sure guard against the onsets of accident? Is there a muscle that may not be torn?—a bone, that may not be broken? Is the eye or hand, the brain or heart, a moment safe? Disease—may it not be inhaled with the breath, taken with the food, contracted by a touch? And does it not search the whole form? Does it not try every fibre? Does it not congest, obstruct, inflame, consume? What scalpel of the anatomist can equal its subtle dissections? How soon, by such causes, may that same perfect specimen, as it is so vainly styled, be thrown into a delirium of agony, in which even the faintest remembrance of ease shall be as impossible as its sweetest and fullest enjoyment!

But, if I thus speak of the seemingly perfect, what shall be said of the imperfect! Shall I call up their defective, distorted, debilitated, and ghastly varieties? I cannot. Shall I expatiate on the difference between the cripple who looks from his threshold, and the hunter who climbs the mountain? between the ear which is entranced by the softest sigh of love, and that which takes no note of the nearest and loudest thunder?—between the tongue which has pregathered the stillness of the sepulchre, and that which is ever vocal with the music and eloquence of all that life has taught it?—or, between the eye which sees not the edge of the precipice but a step before it, and that which reads the star-hymens, written by the fingers of Omnipotence on the farthest walls of the temple of immensity? Shall I dilate on the contrast of the crooked and imbecile to the straight and strong; or of the fulness, force, and flush of maturing health, to the long languor of thin and glazed consumption? Let us dismiss such contemplations. The truth is vivid enough, and im-

pressive enough, without them. And this truth, so simply suggested, is, that whatever is admirable in our physical constitution is counterbalanced by something deplorable in its condition—and that its realities are sadly at variance with its idealities.

What, then, is our mental constitution? What is its ideal? It is more wonderful. No one class of the professors of mental science can fairly and fully unfold it. It is more than phrenology, or metaphysics, or transcendentalism would make it. It consists of the eclectic verities of all natural and spiritual systems—the harmony of all styles and accomplishments of thought—an ideal of which it might be said, that it glitters with all the regalia of genius, and lavishes, with royal munificence, on all its realm, the amplest treasures of learning; were it not, that it is above royalty, too pure for vestments, too beautiful for jewelry, and too rich in its distributions to be compared with the expenditure of an empire, or the wealth of a world. How shall we contemplate such an agency? Is not knowledge its only object? Does it not relate to the endless acquirement and wisest employment of knowledge? And are not its adaptations, in both connexions, and its attainments and achievements by them, the vaunting and idolatry of every land and age?

But what is condition? What the degree and vigor of its development? What the position and circumstances in which it is placed?

Generally speaking, the degree of development is very low. In the great majority of our race, there seems to be no consciousness of the highest intellectual powers. In others, there is a partial disclosure of nearly all. In others, the full exhibition of some one noble faculty creates distinction. In others, a similar exhibition of several of the selectest faculties gives pre-eminent distinction. But, in how few do we witness the glorious unveiling of a complete mental orb! And, in cases where something of this kind does appear, how feeble is the manifestation in comparison with its expected vigor! How often is it more like the full moon, than the full sun—the pale and powerless reflection instead of the glowing and fruitful radiation. But, when we meet, as if in a very angel, the revelation of all mental energies in one person, and every energy in its utmost intensity—still, what difficulties remain, because of his position and circumstances! Let even these be as propitious as the loftiest and most richly provided of earthly elevations can



supply—still, what disadvantage lingers which no earthly faculty can escape ! In a word, what can earth teach him ? With countless assurances of ability to comprehend all knowledge, what is there for him to learn ? On the theory we are now considering, which necessarily excludes inspired instruction, I again demand, what can he learn ? And I answer—nothing, which, under such circumstances, is worth the learning. Whether, therefore, we regard the condition of the few or of the many, it cannot be made correspondent with the intimations of the constitution—the real is miserably meagre, in comparison with the ideal.

What, then, is our moral constitution ? What, its ideal ? It is most wonderful. The graduation rises from instrument to agent, and from agent to principal. The principality is here. The sovereignty is here. If the object of each of the other departments of our nature may be declared by one word, so may the object of this. If it be the object of the physical, to act ; and the mental, to know ; so it is of the moral, to love. To live—is to love, know, and act. What then, could furnish a fairer ideal than this ? All principles, sentiments, affections, emotions, inclinations, sympathies, passions, impulses—all the promptings, directing, determining and sustaining powers,—united, in the pure, sweet, gentle, generous, joyful influence and dominion of love—a spirit that is as dignified as it is amiable, as mighty as it is meek, as majestic as it is simple, taking hold on all that is great and all that is little, humbling the exalted, exalting the humble, and reconciling all extremes of interest in equal and common good.

But how does the condition compare with the constitution ? In many cases, I gladly acknowledge, the comparison is delightful—though, in such, it is not hard to perceive, even though the fact be not confessed, the refinements of a celestial visitation. The fountain of my own tears is ofteneast unsealed by the soft and sudden finger-touch of the seraph of moral beauty. The heart instantly melts in the vision of this loveliness. But ask the most blameless moralist, if his self-examined and conscious character match his moral ideal ? And you must hear a painful answer—painful, because of its want of candor, or, its exposure of evil. But, the millions you need not ask. Hatred, for love ; foulness, for holiness ; passion, for principle ; lust, for affection ; anger, for meekness ; petulance, for patience ; remorse, instead of peace ;

and fear, instead of hope—these, and such as these, are the sad substitutions every where seen. Policy, expediency, interest, may throw many restraints around them; but the realization of the true ideal is scarcely ever dreamed of, and if it were, at best it could be but a dream.

Still glancing, quickly, from point to point, let me add to this statement of man's nature, something similar respecting his relations. These are social and natural.

The social relations are three—domestic, civil, and religious.

The domestic constitution is beautiful. It is the ideal of all we mean by a happy home. And there is nothing on earth so attractive. A good marriage, and a well-blended progeny; conjugal congeniality; parental and filial interchange of intelligence and affection; brotherly and sisterly attentions; protected, respected, and grateful service; out-going charity; ingathered hospitality; industry, order, neatness, quiet, peace, plenty, comfort—a house-full of all comfort!—that seems as near my meaning as anything I can say. Let him whose experience teaches him the meaning, exult in the real and perfect the ideal.

I hasten to the inquiry—how does its condition compare with its constitution? That there are instances which approach correspondence, has been already sufficiently intimated. To these may be added others, which, notwithstanding occasional perplexities and jarrings, are yet generally pleasant. But, of how many more, must it be said, that their condition is as ugly as their constitution is beautiful! The relations subsisting—husband and wife, parents and children, brothers and sisters, master and man, mistress and maid, host and guest—some, or all, of these relations, and their obligations, in full force; and yet—indolence, insubordination, confusion, noise, vexation, discomfort—a house full of discomfort—destructive, almost, of their daily estate! And where such evils are not displayed, how frequently ignorance, affliction, and poverty prevent the realization of a happy home!

But, turn to the civil constitution. This is a noble ideal. The union of persons and families in one great state—with its common government; its defended interests—agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial; its arts and sciences; its literature and philosophy; all the elements and forms of national dignity, prosperity, and power—uniting successive

generations in the execution of the same measures ; perpetuating conventional agreements and institutions until their very antiquity makes them venerable and hallowed ; and girding, by their fame and by their agents, the ends of the earth—surely this is a noble contemplation. Whether a patriarchate, a chieftainship, a monarchy, an aristocracy, a republic, or a democracy—the general notions of union, improvement, safety and glory, involved to a greater or less extent in them all, cannot but challenge admiring regard.

But, what is to be said of its condition ? If it be, as alleged, that “power is always stealing from the many to the few,” and that, once in possession by the few, “its tremendous tendency is to accumulation,” can it also be said, that the few always exercise it, as they ought, for the good of the many ? Is there an incorruptible government on earth ? Nay—is there a government not already corrupt ? Is there a State, not oppressed ? Is there not a nation, not imposed upon, outraged, and abused, by its own proper guardians and guides ? Where does the real image the ideal ? Nowhere !

Turn, then, to the religious constitution. What shall I say of this ? It is a magnificent ideal—a grand, a glorious, an infinitely vast and splendid ideal. No epithets can be turgid here. Yet, on the theory which governs these thoughts, for the present, and which rejects the only true religion—there is nothing so mean and contemptible. For, it is an ideal of fiction, of superstition, of fanaticism, a fantastical ideal, suggested by some vague and timid craving. Even christianity may be, and it is to be feared sometimes is, subordinated to this ideal : and, instead of being rejected, as it ought to be, if not true, is, like other systems, at once received and disbelieved.

What, then, is the condition of religion ? Worse than bad—inexpressibly wretched. Nothing appears, or can appear, on this scheme, at all comparable to the true notion. It is a matter of state-craft, of church hypocrisy, of personal pretence, of universal dissimulation and self-seeking—the instrument of extortion, robbery assassination, massacre and war ; of all kinds and degrees of abominations.

So much for the social relations. Now, look at the natural. By these, I mean the connexion of man with the general system of the earth and the universe.

What, then, is this constitution ? Or, the ideal—in this connexion ? It is exceedingly extended and picturesque.

An ideal world, adapted to the ideal man—large enough for the common and commodious occupancy of a population of innumerable millions—composed of elements, harmless in all their combinations, useful in all their products, and so distributed as to minister to every want and anticipate every desire. A world, filling every sense with inexhaustible freshness of enjoyment—perfuming without faintness every breath: regaling the taste with no fear of ill by the varied flavor of all food; entertaining the ear, without a note of discord, with the melodies and harmonies of all music; and opening to the eye, without a single offensive contrast, all visions of beauty and rapture—the ever-changing panorama of the seasons, with the green spring, yellow summer, and the purple autumn, always rejoicing in the vales; and the white winter always, if not only, frosting the loftiest summits above them, cooling the down-flowing waters, and the up-blowing winds, and imaging to the pure below the still greater purity of the regions to which they point:—these, and, with these, the daily, simple, ample, watchless glory of sunrise, noon, and sunset; the near, mighty love-match of the fair and gentle moon; the far-off gaze of the timid and tremulous stars; the brief but glad pause of the pale-returning comet, hovering in the midst of sister-spheres so long unseen; and a thousand humbler and more familiar meteor angels, shooting their rockets through the dust of the evening, hanging their showery and seven-hued bows on the cliffs of the morning, and oft, through the serene expanse of invisible mist, diffusing the earliest or latest sunbeams, from east to west, or from west to east, in all the open heaven, until the cities and villages of common pomp and peace: the gardens, orchards, meadows, and grain-fields of the unblighted Edens around them; the rivers, lakes, and safe-rolling seas, among or beyond them; and the mid-way terraces of the moss-hung and cedar-shaded mountains—with their icy pinnacles ever seeming to rise higher and shine brighter; all kindle, and glow, and burn, like forms and motions of gold and fire, in full reflection of the glorious firmament above them. A world, not only thus teeming with comfort, and forever inspiring the imagination with the sentiments of poetry and art, but calling the intellect to the sublimer task of mastering its internal symbols and their significations; comprehending its planetary connexions and dependencies; and deducing from outward grandeur, variety, and loveliness, the laws of all science, and the principles of all philosophy!

But, what is the condition of this constitution? How does the real compare with the ideal, in this case? Little, if any, better, than in the others. One broad inscription of imperfection reaches from pole to pole. The hostilities of the lower animals, among themselves, and toward mankind; the inequalities, in respect of natural blessings, in human society; deserts of ice and fire; vast wildernesses; dangerous waters' volcanoes; earthquakes; tempests; famines; plagues; and the causes of all ordinary, but most afflictive and destructive diseases and accidents—are evidences here. There is no rational way of treating these things but as conditional imperfections. Ever spinning on its axis, and ever bowling round the sun, on, and on, and still on, rolls the world, bearing indisputable testimony to the universe, that the most enlarged and enchanting ideal may be encompassed by the real in all-penetrating and all-subduing evil.

Such is life—on this theory! This is its nature, and these are its relations.

What now? Can we believe that such as life thus seems, it is all it ever was?—that the physical condition of our race never better corresponded with its constitutional ideal than it does now?—that its mental, never did?—that its moral, never did?—that its social relations were never designed to be better illustrated?—that its natural relations were never more benignant and blissful? Can we believe, that in all these respects, life never will be more than it seems?—that there is no good hope of thorough, substantial, and permanent improvement?

And, thus receiving the doctrine of the theory, shall we therefore, in deliberate selfishness, set ourselves to the work of fulfilling its precept? Shall we devote ourselves to the task of making the most of such a life, according to our own will and pleasure, irrespectively of our neighbor's welfare in this world, or our own in any other? Shall we? I prolong the inquiry. Hope gone, despair come, selfishness triumphant—say—shall we abandon ourselves to this motive?

If so, what can be made of such a life? What can the infirm, the ignorant, the immoral make of it? What can the members of a wretched family, the subjects of an oppressive government, the slaves of a cruel religion, make of it? What can the dwellers of venomous, dreary, sickly countries, make of it? Nay, what can the most fortunate, in these respects, make of it? Any thing worth the effort?



What has been made of it? Even this theory has a history—of several thousand years. Let the scroll be brought forth. Let it be unbound. Let it be unrolled. Let it be read, distinctly and loudly, that all may hear. I grant you, it is an impressive record. Pleasure has been made of life—such as would stir the young blood, to tell. And wealth, and power and fame have been made of it—such as would stir the old blood, to tell. Ask!—what has been made of it? See the palaces and domains, which have been illumined by a thousand festivals? See how the treasures of empire have been gathered and lavished as personal possessions? See how sceptres have been seized, crowns won, and thrones secured! See how the renown of ages has been anticipated by the acclamations of a day! Ask, rather, what has not been made of it?

But I am not, and cannot be, so satisfied. This is the blazonry of the few. I ask for the many. What have they made of life? You tell me of the architect—I ask for the builders. You tell me of the planter—I ask for the laborers. You tell me of the hero—I ask for the host. You tell me of the monarch—I ask for the subjects. The millions—for them I inquire. What have they made of it? Pain and poverty, slavery and contempt, tears, and toil, and blood!

And so rises, the chief inquiry! For how long did the few make so much of life—and the many, so little? Let death answer! Hitherto, his pale visage has been excluded. Now, let him in. See!—how the ghastly tyrant smiles! Hark!—with what cruel coldness he speaks of having swept into the grave innumerable generations! All physical varieties—the fairest and the most infirm; all mental varieties—the most stolid ignorance and the most brilliant erudition; all moral varieties—the purest and the foulest. All relative interests—husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant; the prince and the peasant, the philosopher and the idiot, the orator and the mute, the artist and the clown, the priest and his dupe, the rover of the desert and the denizen of the city—all have been swept, ay—swept into the grave—swept with the refuse of all things—swept as a nuisance from the presence of their proud and perishing survivors—swept quickly—half of them in childhood, millions on millions, just as youth grew lovely and the world attractive, other millions in the midst of the plans of mature life, and others, in the marvellous dotage of a premature and speedy

decay—too feeble to totter to the close of even four-score years. O, how often, in writing and speaking, pen and tongue labor to express the inexpressible! How they labor here! How the indefinable awe, the thunder-smitten wonder, the astounded and quivering consciousness prompt the vain wish for some word of electric opening—of flashing and vivid disclosure of his unexperienced mystery! How calmly it should be whispered—how wildly it should be shrieked—if it could only be commanded!—that one word of infinite mockery, wherewith to answer the question—what has been made of life? For want of such a word, all I can say is—it has been remanded to its origin. Like the marsh-meteor, it has fallen whence it sprang. Its course has been from darkness to darkness. It has been reduced to nothingness. On this theory, it is nothing. A hundred times as many of our race as are now breathing, generations that thronged and shook the world, on this theory, are now nothing. And we can expect no other fate. So “let us eat, drink, and be merry—for, to-morrow we die!”

Is not such a life despicable? Who could do else than despise it? Only let me be assured that such is life, and—I repeat my first avowal—I will be proud to despise it.

Surely the whole contemplation implies something better. Let us, therefore, consider the better system:

## II. THE THEORY OF BENEVOLENCE.

What is the theory of benevolence? Its distinguishing doctrine—in contrast to the theory of selfishness, is—that life, as it seems, is not all it is, much less all it ever was and will be: that it is infinitely more noble than it appears, and has been displayed, and is to be again, in personal and relative grandeur, in immediate affiliation to the Deity, and immortal communion with his nature and works. From this doctrinal distinction, proceeds the great practical principle—that, in the intermediate and humbled condition of our race, the object of life must be to do good, by seeking redemption from this lapsed estate, and the restoration of ourselves and others to the proper felicities of our nature and relations.

What, then, is life—according to this theory? This, at least, may be answered—there is nothing in it to despise. Rather, the whole view of it, is ineffably glorious.

Remembering that this is the supernatural theory; received, in faith, as a true and redeeming revelation from God: the fact that its disclosures vastly transcend the perceptions of sense; and, that miracles of majesty, glory, beauty, and bliss come in to relieve and magnify the littleness and darkness of nature, cannot be a matter of reasonable objection to it. On the contrary, such peculiarities would be anticipated.

This theory is a sort of noon-tide demonstration. The evidence of its heavenly origin is found in the unearthly universality and intensity of its brightness. I invite you, therefore, now to a contemplative exercise. The sphere of life revolves in this splendor, as in a radiance not its own; and, without pausing to philosophise on its source, or the mode of its transmission, I yield myself rather to the simple observation of the scenes it successively unfolds.

Here, is no implication of imperfection. The most desolate regions that turn upon our vision, have the promise of perfection; and others, the unblighted or renovated, show it.

Here, the widest disagreement between our constitution and condition is shown to be controllable, even in current cases: while, as respects the past and future, the difference entirely disappears—and our whole being is developed in the triune fulness of its god-like glory, and the correspondent blessedness of its boundless and imperishable estate.

Here, the ideal and real are seen to be twin-sisters—so much alike, that even their Divine Father can scarcely tell one from the other. I see them, on their diamond thrones—of equal pomp and power. Each one wears, in the frontlet of her golden crown, the star of wisdom. Each one is clasped, at the centre of her purple girdle, by the star of love. Each one carries, on the head of her sceptre, the star of omnipotence. These symbols of their sire, are their own. And lo! with what excellency of simplicity, their graceful forms are folded in their flowing robes! With what ever-changing light, as in the summer evening's cloud, the electric energies of their pinions play among their rustling plumes! And with what surpassing beauty, the smile of the highest rests upon the blushing loveliness of their uplifted and adoring countenances! But, see! a sudden change! The throne of the real grows dark as granite. She descends from it; assumes a dull disguise; wraps herself in manifold sackcloth;

scarcely shows, in her penitent garb, the slightest intimation of dignity or grace; sighs—weeps—mourns—seems ready to perish. But the ideal changes not. She stoops, indeed, from her throne, but its radiance illumines her path. She forsakes not her sister. She stops, or moves, with her—and is forever at her side. But she throws no sackcloth over her adornings, and draws no veil over the fairness and sweetness of her face. Rather, she assumes a more winning art; keeps ever before her sister the image of her own proper condition, and the hope of renewed attractions when the days of her humiliation are over. And so, ere long, another change occurs. God cannot endure this difference between His darling daughters. He breathes into the heart of the mourner the living music of pardon and peace. He bids her rise, and, as she rises, the sackcloth's sudden and open net-work of white and shrivelling cords shows that the lightning of the infolded plumes has touched it, and, soon as shown, the last shred vanishes forever! And there she stands, in all her first glory, beauty, and bliss! And God himself is again at a loss to distinguish the real from the ideal. Arm in arm, the sister-seraphs glide through creation, charming the circling spheres with melodies richer than their own—until, returning towards their thrones, the diamond splendors again flash through that granite gloom, and blending with the radiance of the throne by its side, heighten the coming pomp of their glittering stars and sandals.

Now, therefore, let us review the human constitution and estate, that so we may answer the inquiry—what is life, according to the theory of benevolence?

Man, himself, what is he? Let history, observation, and prophecy reply.

This theory has a noble history—not a miserable compend of defective views, erroneous reflections, and wild imaginings: modified by the foolish traditions of the past, and revised and perverted by the partisan interests of the present, but, an inspired history: a history dictated to elect amanuenses, by Him who made the world, and has governed all its changes. What does this history say?

What does it say, in respect to our physical constitution? By an impressive gradation, of the varieties of the real, it identifies the true ideal, suggests, illustrates, and

insures perfection. I allude to instances of longevity, translation, creation, and resurrection.

That this history reveals a degree of longevity, of which there is no other authentic comparable record, will not be denied. That this revelation, in these as in other particulars, is to be received just as we find it, will scarcely be questioned. It is so harmonious with the entire system of creation and redemption, that it would seem as well to reject any other part of it as this.

Some of the post-diluvian patriarchs attained to great age. Jacob, who was a hundred and forty-seven years old when he died, stood before Pharaoh, when a hundred and thirty, and spoke most plaintively of the brevity of his life, in comparison with that of his ancestors. "And Jacob said unto Pharaoh, the days of the years of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers, in the days of their pilgrimage." It may not be impracticable to find a person of a hundred and thirty years, in our own day; but it would be very strange to see such a one standing up with the promise of seventeen years more sparkling in his eyes, and stranger still, to hear him complain that the evils of his life had made his days so few, and so far short of the days of his fathers. Isaac died at 180. Abraham, at 175. So, ascending from son to father, from Abraham to the flood, we find these ages: Terah, 205; Nahor, 148; Serug, 230; Reu, 239; Peleg, 239; Eber, 464; Salah, 433; Arphaxad, 438; Shem, 600; and so we reach Noah, who lived in the Old World 600 years, and in the New, 350, in all 950.

Of the ante-diluvians, Enoch, whose stay was shortest of those whose ages are recorded, spent 365 years in this world, before God took him to the better. Lamech, who died earliest of the rest, was 777. Only one of the others, Mahaleel, is below 900, and he died at 895. The remainder, range from 905 to 969, the united ages of the nine, from Adam to Lamech, being 7,625, long enough, if they had lived in such succession, to have allowed each one of them to spend more than 200 years with his predecessor, and the whole nine thus personally and intimately acquainted, to have occupied the world from its creation until now.

It must be remembered, that all these ages are registered in the same book, by the same historian, under the Divine direction, the book of Genesis, or the Generation, prepared



for the very purpose of supplying a history of the world, not otherwise accessible; embracing a range, from the beginning, of more than two thousand years; and embodying events, and with them principles of utmost importance to the interests of our race, and the honor of the Divine administration: a history, which, though it has been more violently assailed than any other extant, has come forth from every dark and furious besieging, as the sun comes forth from the storm, without a flicker, to show that the wind swept it; without a smoke-wreath, to show that the lightning struck it; and without a shadow, to show that the cloud covered it; as calm, smooth, and bright as ever, in its untouched and untouchable sublimity, and as gloriously benignant as ever in its boundless benefactions!

That we may be more impressed by these instances of longevity, as bearing on our subject, let us imagine a few illustrations, connecting, as briefly as possible, the past with the present. If Abraham had lived as long as Methuselah, he might have counselled Joseph during the years of famine: encouraged the Israelites through their centuries of bondage; assisted Moses in the work of their deliverance; soothed them by his patience in the sorrows of the wilderness; accompanied Joshua into the promised land; instructed the Judges in their successive administrations; and stood by the side of Samuel, when he anointed Saul, as the first king of Israel.

If Moses had lived so long, he might have passed on from that anointing, and witnessed the fall of the giant, by the Shepherd-boy's sling; have stood by the throne of David, heard his harp, and united in his Psalms; participated, with Solomon, in the solemnities of the dedication of the temple, and seen the glory of the Lord come down, as of old, into the Holy of Holies; witnessed the separation of the tribes, in the reign of Rehoboam; survived the reigns of fourteen succeeding kings of Judah, and eighteen kings of Israel; been present, at the triumph of Elijah on Carmel, and lingered behind him when he ascended in the chariot of fire; cheered Elisha; congratulated Josiah; been enchanted with the seraph eloquence of Isaiah, Amos, and Hosea; wept, at the plaint of Jeremiah; and died in the midst of interchanging desecrations and reformatations, captivities and returns, unrelieved, but by the multiplying and gladdening indications of the coming Messiah.

If Samuel had lived so long, he would have witnessed the destruction of the first temple, and Jerusalem with it; the carrying away of the people to Babylon, their seventy years stay there, and then their return; the rebuilding of the temple and city; and the re-establishment of the pure worship of God. The four major and twelve minor prophets, might all have blown their silver trumpets in his hearing. He would have known the completion of the Old Testament; might have gone out with Jaddua, the high priest, to meet Alexander the Great; seen that boasted son of Jupiter Ammon, worshiping in the temple of Jehovah; learned the founding of Alexandria, and the colonizing of Jews there; beheld his country included in the partitioning of the conquests of Alexander among his successors; and, after watching the progress of the Septuagint translation, have laid down his life within two centuries of the advent of our Redeemer.

If Elijah had lived so long, he might have heard the song of the angels; looked, with the shepherds, on the Son of God; assisted in the ministry of John; waited on the ministry of Christ; and ascended with his Master to the skies.

If Isaiah had lived so long, he might have stood by the cross, and seen the "wounds" which were received "for our transgressions;" stood by the tomb, and seen the Son of God "prolong his days;" stood in the midst of the Pentecostal tongues of fire, reminding him of the time when his own lips were touched by the live coal from the altar, and there beheld "the pleasure of the Lord," prospering in the hands of the glorified Saviour. He might have contemplated the whole ministry of the apostles; the final overthrow of the Jewish temple, city, and polity; the dispersion of the chosen nation, for the last time, and for so long a time, over all the earth; the coming of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God, to "sit down," as His children, "with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," in the true succession of faith; and the full breaking of that "latter day glory," which he so vividly foretold.

If Paul had lived so long—he might have witnessed the reigns of more than 60 Roman emperors; the division into the eastern and western empires; the succession of some 50 emperors of the east, and some 25 of the west; and the establishment of the kingdoms of Italy, Spain, France, and England—surviving Charlemagne, Alfred the Great, and many of their successors. Or, to come down by another line, he would have passed through the ten persecutions, and seen the enthronement of Christianity, by Constantine. He might

have attended seven general councils; witnessed the rise of almost innumerable heresies; the consummation of the development of the man of sin; the succession of more than 100 popes, or bishops, of Rome; and some 16 archbishops of Canterbury; the fearful unfolding of Mohammedanism, in the fairest fields of his own first labors; and the very midnight of the dark ages, resting, heavy and almost rayless, on all the christian world.

Leaving Scriptural examples, a moment, for the sake of reaching the present, if the "venerable Bede," who according to the previous supposition, might have dictated the last sentence of his translation of John to Paul himself, had lived so long, he might have seen the separation of the Greek church; the crusades; and the inquisition: might have commenced with Wiclif, Huss, and Luther; attended the councils of Constance, Trent, and others; looked in upon the Synod of Dort; and almost gained the Westminster assembly, while Wiclif, the harbinger of the Reformation, had he been favored with such a lease of life, would be with us now, with nearly half his term unexpired.

The use that I make of the longevity of the patriarchs, is this: it necessarily suggests the idea of greater physical perfection than is enjoyed at present. There was nothing miraculous in it. Rather, it required a miracle, or, a succession of miracles, afterward, to arrest the tendency. The constitution was so enduring, simply because of its natural vigor, certainly implying the most admirable organization and action.

But, allusion was made to intimations of perfection, afforded by instances of translation, creation and resurrection, as well as longevity. As few words must suffice here.

In connexion with our present knowledge of the atmosphere, and the computations of astronomical distances, the notion of translation is, perhaps, generally regarded, as one of the most wonderful disclosures of our holy religion. Yet, it is no more so than that of creation, or resurrection, or even the fact of extraordinary longevity. Probably, it is as generally a matter of incredulity, that a man should live nearly a thousand years in this world; as that he should ascend to the moon, or the sun, or any other world. Besides, it is to be remembered, that the earlier revelation is illustrated by the later, in this, as in other particulars; and, that an instantaneous change is implied, to fit the subject for such removal. The chief cases are those of Enoch and Elijah. Doubtless the

same change which is to be wrought on all the living, at the last day, was experienced by them. "In the twinkling of an eye," they were perfected; and, being perfected, they were translated, that they "should not see death."

The examples of creation and resurrection, are, of course, those of the first and second Adam, or, the earthly man and the heavenly man. As respects the former, there can be no doubt of his primitive perfection. As respects the latter, if he were not physically perfect before his crucifixion, which, however, there are many reasons for supposing he was; there can be no doubt that he became so, at, or soon after, his resurrection. The first, moreover, is an example of intended immortality; the second of actual immortality. In the former case, the intention was broken; in the latter, it could not be. Physically, Adam died, and remains dead; but "Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." The first case, shows us perfection in the beginning of the world; the second, in a late age, and, indeed, even at the present moment: for, while the relics of the "earthly man" are mingled with the elements which were cursed for his transgression, the person of the "heavenly" glows amidst the glory of the close throne of God. To describe it, minutely, is impossible; but somewhat of its character may be gleaned from the circumstances both of its humiliation and exaltation. Living without food, walking on the water, rising to the sky; these are intimations of an instrumentality entirely submissive to the will of the spirit. Out-shining the sun, as in the arrest of Saul; and causing John, who had rested his head on his bosom in Jerusalem, to fall at his feet as dead in Patmos, even because of his shaded splendor; these are intimations of an infinitely refined and radiant existence. And so, as by the merest hints, we come to the historic ideal of perfect and imperishable beauty! If the design in respect to the first Adam had been realized, the lungs that were expanded, by the breath of God in Eden, might have been breathing yet. As it is, the second Adam, already nearly twice the age of Methuselah, still lives, with abundant assurance that he will live forever. And the fulfilment of prophecy may be prelearned from the promise, "Because I live, ye shall live, also."

But, I cannot forsake the range of history, without a few remarks in relation to our mental and moral constitution, ac-



cording to this theory. It is plain enough, that life is not now, all it ever was, in respect to the body; and it may be made equally plain, that neither is it all it ever was, in respect of the soul.

What, then, is the testimony of this history, in relation to our mental constitution? Here, again, the case of Adam is instructive. You remember a token of his incomparable qualifications to originate natural science. The Lord brought unto him "every beast of the field and every fowl of the air," "to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof." And so the foundations of zoology and ornithology were laid in Paradise. To my mind, this record is intended to suggest a constitutional capacity for observation and reflection; a comprehensive discrimination of recognition; a certainty of classification and nomenclature, in respect of all natural objects, never witnessed since. Another of his manifest distinctions, was, the faculty of free, familiar, intelligible communion with his Maker, by which means, without any intermediate agency, all knowledge and wisdom would have remained accessible forever.

Coming down, through all the ages subsequent to the fall, to the time of the apostles, we find, in all the history of the church, patriarchal, levitical, and christian, indications of the ideal grandeur of our mental constitution, seen no where else. The chief distinction to which I now refer, the crown and glory of all, is inspiration. That it is a distinction, instead of a common enjoyment, is an incident of imperfection. Compare the original condition of the inspired, with their ultimate estate and attainments. Historians, as they became, never equalled in the world; lawgivers, poets, philosophers, orators, prophets, universal linguists, and workers of all miracles. If such acquirements and uses of knowledge were never known, before or since; if, in all the 39 books of the Old Testament, and the 27 of the New, or, the 66, of the whole Bible, it is utterly impossible to find proof of intellectual incompetency, if there be no diversion from the purpose; no lowering of dignity; no lessening of energy; no intrusion of incongruity; if, on the contrary, there be in it, such a collection of illustrations of mental sufficiency as can no where else be found, such simplicity of narrative, such majesty of law, such ecstacy of poetry, such purity of philosophy, such truthful and glorious eloquence, such certain and far-reaching prophecy, such instant understanding and modu-



lation of unknown tongues, as the utmost opulence of uninspired genius would be exhausted, in a moment, to match in a single particular, let it be remembered, notwithstanding, that all this is merely a slight intimation of our proper mental action. For, if the mind, in its present condition of partial development, be so admirably responsive to the impulse of its Creator, what would it be, if the perfection of its constitution were fully unfolded? If the harp, some of whose strings are broken, and others hanging loose, may yet be taught to breathe such notes of rapture; Oh! if He who made it, and who declared that the enthroned Psalmist was "a man after his own heart," should retune it, as His own "glory," to the delicacy of His own ear, and then, upraising it on His footstool, should straighten Himself on His throne, and waken, with His own unerring fingers, all its harmonies, how would the universe stand entranced, charmed to the stillness of the void from which at first it came!

Yet, there is One, who needs no redemption. I mean, the Redeemer, "the man, Christ Jesus," "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Contemplate the perfection of his intellect, and learn, that life, as now it seems, is not, in this respect either, all it ever was.

But, what is the testimony of this history, in relation to our moral constitution? It is yet more full and satisfactory. It is both a natural and spiritual disclosure. Adam, again, is the example of the first; being created "in the image of God." Pre-eminently was that a holy creation. True, its glory was soon darkened. But, from that day to the present, what has been the purpose of God, but to make men holy? What greater fact is there, in all the annals of time, than this, that the Church has always existed, from the beginning until now? There have been intervals, in which there was no State. But there never was one, in which there was no Church. And what is the design of the Church, but, to make men holy? It is this distinctive attribute, that has always made the true Church, "a peculiar people." Others have enjoyed physical good. Others have been endued with genius, and endowed with learning, sufficient to win all the plaudits of fame. But this richer moral possession, this *oïsean* Paradise in the waste of a world's wickedness, has been their own, exclusive inheritance. In this spirit, they have lived, and moved, and had their being. I need not announce them. It is enough to say, that the record of their names, and principles, and deeds, and sufferings, and triumphs, is the noblest record in

the world. Life has been as different from what it seems, to the selfish, as is heaven from hell. In myriads of instances, the change in the moral nature has been so great; the revolution so complete and decisive; the improvement so gracious and glorious, that the ideal has nearly found its counterpart in the real. We can easily understand that the oldest of men might have lived longer; that the greatest genius might have been still greater; and the most accomplished scholar, more erudite, but, it is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine more disinterested benevolence than has been a thousand times demonstrated. Men, naturally even as others, but suddenly inspired with wisdom and virtue from heaven, have given up, for still superior interests, family and friends, home and country, property, reputation, liberty, and life! Could they have done more? Only Bible phrases can describe such changes. To be thus redeemed, is to be "born again," implying that our first birth is merely animal, and that another is necessary to make us men. It is to be "created anew," as though nothing could avail, but thorough dissolution and re-organization. Such miracles have been wrought in all ages.

Still, to see the ideal fully exemplified, we must again consider "the man, Christ Jesus." Perhaps, he did not design to display, in his own person, physical perfection. Perhaps he did not, mental perfection. But none can doubt, that he intended to exhibit, and did exhibit, moral perfection. What purity, sympathy, benevolence, in a word, what love, essential, efficient, unchangeable, and self-sacrificing love, did he disclose! Then, for once, the holiest inhabitants of heaven found on earth a character so divinely good, as to deserve their profoundest homage, and constant, adoring imitation. Morally, therefore, as well as physically and mentally, life, as now it seems, is far from being all it ever was.

But let us complete the historic review. What says the record, in respect of human relations? Socially and naturally, are these, as they seem, all they ever were?

As respects social relations, our attention is immediately challenged by a remarkable peculiarity. The intimations of perfection are not to be gathered from similar facts, here.

Even in this history, there is no example of domestic perfection! Nor is there any approximation to it, excelling what may be found, in christian society, in our own day. There might have been a perfect family in Eden, but the opportu-

nity was lost. No other has been afforded. The family in the ark was not perfect. The tents of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, had their jarrings. The home of Bethany, even when Christ was present, was not without its complaints.

Neither is there any example of civil perfection! In this respect, also, the past gains little, if any thing, from comparison with the present. The first law, was soon broken. The Jews were rebellious, even under the theocracy. All systems have been modified by circumstances, and soon shaken and overthrown.

Neither is there any example of religious perfection! The essential spirit of it has been bestowed: but no perfect and invariable form has been prescribed or illustrated.

These are great differences! How shall we account for them? These institutions are not perpetual. They are mere preparatives for the final and true organizations. God, at first, designed one family, one state, one church. He still designs the same. The first Adam forfeited his headship over all. The second Adam bears his three-fold office, in his stead. "Of Him, the Whole Family, in heaven and earth, is named," not Adamites, but Christians. He is the "Only Potentate, king of kings, and lord of lords." He is our great High Priest, the head over all things to the Church. That is, Jesus Christ is the Head of the Family, the Head of the State, and the Head of the Church. To the future results of His sovereignty, therefore, we are to look for the perfection of our social relations.

But, how is it, with natural relations? Here, again, we turn to an example of perfection. There is Eden, the Garden of the Lord; the whole earth, in its freshness, beauty, and brightness; the scene that surprised into ecstasy, "the morning stars and sons of God," and caused them to "sing together" and "shout for joy." God himself saw it was "good," i. e. like God; and styled it "very good," i. e. worthy of God. There can be no addition to that testimony. His smile rested on it. The beams of the sun, all day, and of the moon and stars, all night, were not so numerous, brilliant, or searching, as the silent benedictions of His countenance. Such, doubtless, he desired it to remain. It was impaired slowly, and by repeated efforts, as if reluctantly. Even after the curse fell, beauty lingered. Too much beauty lingered. Its charms were fatal. Therefore, the wreck of the deluge was added to the first blighting. That over, the Lord suspended His bow in the sky! But, it was not

bent downward. It was bent upward! It seemed to be strongly drawn, but no arrow was in it. It symbolized the turning away of wrath from the world, for the sake of Him who, standing by the throne, welcomed the sped arrow to His own blessed and bleeding bosom!

Still, the brief revelation of those first attractions is enough to remind us, that life, in these natural relations, also, is not all it ever was!

What, then, are the discoveries of observation? I use this term, for want of a better. It poorly expresses the purpose of its employment. I allude to a twofold process, natural and spiritual, comprehending not only the things that are seen, but, also, the objects of faith, which is the evidence of things not seen. So understood, observation, rightly exercised, shows, that even now life is more than to the selfish it seems.

It may not be more physically, but, it is more, mentally and morally. The truth of revelation, to those who duly study it; and the holiness of revelation, to those who duly cherish it, make it more. It is more, relatively. There is a greater difference, than seems to be, between families, states, and religions; and in respect to personal connexions with external nature.

But, my chief allusion, here, is, to spiritual discernment. "God is not the God of the dead; but of the living." To Him, there are no dead! So, to us, on this theory, there are no dead! Enoch, Elijah, and, it may be, myriads who ascended with Christ, enjoy, this moment, the perfection of the human constitution. The miracles of the last day will have no application to them. They may see the resurrection of the dead, but not feel it. They may behold the change of the living, but not undergo it. They are what they shall be, forever. But these are few. The vast majority are "absent from the body." Yet, the "spirits of the just" are "made perfect." God sees them, and, standing in His light, we see them. Adam lives yet, and remembers his fall! Abel lives yet, and remembers his last sacrifice! Methuselah lives yet, and considers his stay on earth as the days of his childhood! Noah lives yet, with the surge of the flood still sounding in his soul! Abraham lives yet, and shudders to think how he held the knife over Isaac! Isaac lives yet, and remembers when he "went out to meditate in the field, at the eventide," and exchanged the dreams of hope for the smile of 'Eli-Isak' Jacob lives yet, and seems to recognize the ankers which he

scended and ascended, on the ladder at Bethel! Joseph lives yet, and remembers the cry he could no longer restrain, "I am Joseph your brother!" Moses lives yet, and remembers Sinai and the law! Joshua lives yet, and remembers how the sun and moon obeyed his bidding! Samuel lives yet, and remembers how his appeal was answered by thunder, when Israel preferred the sceptre of Saul to the arm of Omnipotence! David lives yet, and thrills heaven, as well as earth, with his Psalms! And the Prophets live yet, watching their ancient predictions, as they turn into daily history, all over the world! And the Apostles live yet, beholding the "fulness of the Gentiles" fast coming in, and waiting for the "blindness" of Israel to be removed, that all men may see the same Saviour, as they see the same sun! And the Martyrs live yet! Columbus, and Penn, and Washington, live yet! Our fathers live yet. He who was buried yesterday, lives yet! He who dies to-night, will be alive to-morrow! The thousand millions of the visible living, are but a small minority in the presence of the hundred thousand millions of the invisible. Life is more than it seems!

But Prophecy, that is the chief of the witnesses. What does Prophecy say? It is a glad distinction, that this theory is prophetic. All theories have histories, and the theory of selfishness a most voluminous history. But, the theory of benevolence, alone, is prophetic. Its hopes are emboldened by countless fulfillments in past ages. And it looks to two great triumphs in the future, the first, millennial—the second, eternal.

The first, as if in remembrance of the facts and intimations of original perfection, seems designed to restore the world to its primitive condition: gradually prolonging life, by the removal of its oppressions, and the re-invigoration of the constitution by moral and natural influences, until it shall compare with the average of the early post diluvian, and even with that of the ante-diluvian patriarchs: filling out, if fancy may speak for faith, the apparent original intention of a thousand years, so showing, in the end of the world, what was designed in its beginning, enriched by the advantages of all preceding ages of sad, but instructive experience. Then, the intellect shall disclose its power! Then, the heart shall unveil its glory! Then, the whole man shall display the utmost improvements possible, apart from the intervention of death! Then, the social relations shall assume a fairer loveliness than they have ever yet



worn. Homes, such as the world might have had from the beginning, will throng and bless every land! States, such as the world might have had from the beginning, will extend the shelter of their common sovereignty over rejoicing and peaceful nations! And the churches of one Church will hallow the worshipping race! The natural relations, also, will put on new attractions. Eden, restored, will flush the globe with bloom. The beautiful demonstration will be made—how? when the mind is given to truth, and the heart, to love; and God's blessings are secured by faithful obedience; even a mocked world may be so overrun by exuberant felicities, and so invested in an atmosphere of the purest and serenest elements, and so adorned with the purpling splendors of a peaceful and benignant firmament, as nearly to forget the former curse, and cease to desire the coming renovation.

But, after all, speaking with clearer and deeper assurance, that renovation will come! The return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the transformation of the living, the conflagration of the earth, the judgment of all mankind, the creation of the new heavens and earth, the entrance of the redeemed into the fulness of immortal bliss, and the grandeur of eternal glory, these are the unequalled triumphs yet to be displayed. The resurrection of Lazarus will then find its intimations accomplished! The ascensions of Enoch and Elijah, will then find their symbols answered. The perfection of Adam, will have innumerable counterparts! The perfection of Christ then be imaged in all! The One Family will then be perfected! The One State, will then be perfected. The One Church, will then be perfected! And God, in Christ, will be all in all!

Now, such is life, on this theory! How much more has it been, than it seems! How much more is it, than it seems! How much more, will it be, than it seems!

What then? Is not here, the harmony of the constitutional and conditional? Is not here, the oneness of the real and ideal?

What are the teachings of the past? What, of the future? Perfection! But what does the present teach? Is it not imperfection? And is it not the necessity of effort, for personal and social redemption? Does not the object of life shine out? Is it not, to do good? How can we live worthily, unless we live thus?

What is it, but to take part with Jehovah, in the noblest of His works? What is it, but to comprehend the verities of immensity and eternity, understand our own interest in them, and elevate our affections and exertions to the great task of making it sure? What is it, but to extend the circle of blessings, from the centre of our own safety, to the limits of the world?

Now, therefore, which theory shall we adopt? Which doctrine believe? Which law, obey?

Metinks, if the theory of selfishness could be enlarged a little; if, for instance, it would allow me to live here ten thousand years, and all the resources of the globe were put at my command. I might attempt some plan of self-indulgence. I might build palaces, plant gardens, and gather delights, without number and without measure: palaces, unrivalled, for magnificence and splendor, even in the imaginings of the wildest of enthusiast architects; gardens, excelling even Eden itself; and delights, such as never yet have been collected about the richest and most luxurious of all the princes of the earth! But, for less than ten thousand, for less than one thousand, for less than five hundred, for less than one hundred, for less, it may be, than fifty, twenty, ten, five, for less, it may be, than one year, shall I, can I, believe that this is all, and set myself down to its selfish enjoyment? No, no, never! Or assure me that this is all, and again avow my first sentiment, I shall be proud to despise it! So, well I might be, to despise ten thousand years! for what are they, to infinity? But, in the littleness of our thoughts, there would be some excuse for valuing these.

What then? Bring me back to the true theory, the supernatural theory, the inspired theory, the theory of faith, of redemption, of Benevolence! Let me cherish this. Let me rejoice in this. Let me stand on the summit, whence the retrospect of the past, and the prospect of the future command both earth and heaven, both time and eternity. Let me see what I am! Let me feel what I am! Let me thrill with the sympathies of the living! Let me thrill with the sympathies of those whom the blind style the dead! And then, in harmony with all that is saintly, angelic, and Divine, let me come down to the fields of labor, with a heart, and a hand, for their largest demands!

“Milton! thou shouldst be living at this hour:

The world hath need of thee:—

We are selfish men.

Oh! raise us up, return to us again ;  
And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power.  
Thy soul was like a star, and dwelt apart ;  
Thou hadst a voice, whose sound was like the sea ;  
Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free,  
So didst thou travel on life's common way,  
In cheerful godliness ; and yet thy heart  
The lowliest duties on herself did lay."

Wordsworth ! in sooth, such words are little worth :  
Where fadeless laurels roof his heaven'y bower—  
Well may our Milton rest.

The world hath need  
Of Him, whose whispered peace entranced the storm :  
And at whose death-shout, buried myriads rose !  
Majestic on His throne, let Christ arise :  
To breathe the same sweet spell o'er all earth's strife—  
To raise a race with love, like His, to glow—  
To make a thousand Miltons, silent now—  
A thousand Howards, to relieve the poor—  
A thousand Whitefields, to arouse the Church—  
A thousand Wesleys, to secure the gain—  
A thousand Henrys, freedom's soul to charm—  
A thousand Washingtons—to guard her home !

---

### ARTICLE III.

SACRAMENTAL MEDITATIONS ON THE PRESENCE OF THE  
GLORIOUS BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IN THE HOLY  
SUPPER—TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR.  
ERNST SARTORIUS.

By Rev. G. A. Wenzel, A. M., Philadelphia.

In the midst of the four holy gospels looms high, as a prominent sign of the glory of Christ, the history of the great feast or of the miraculous meal which he, in his compassionate love (Matt. 4, 14), provided, with a few loaves and fishes, for a great multitude, at a time, when the feast of the Passover was nigh, by increasing, whilst casting a look

of thankfulness to the Father, through the exercise of a creative influence, the substance of the provision a thousand-fold and with it refreshing thousands, that they should not perish by the way. This miracle having induced many among the people to follow him on account of the benefits conferred by the temporal bread, he reminds them in an incomparable discourse, that such bodily feeding by him with simple bread would not suffice, and that it was only a sign of an infinitely more excellent food which, proceeding from himself, perishes not, but endures unto eternal life, John 6: 26. After further inquiries on the part of the people he represents himself as the true bread of life, which had come down from heaven to give life to the world and eternal life to all, who should believingly receive and partake of it, and that, moreover, with thrice repeated emphasis and in contradistinction to the manna which Moses had given. (John 6: 35, 48, 51.) In these words is already contained, with an unmistakable reference to a more excellent future feast, the declaration, that a feeding with simple bread, even though miraculously blessed, cannot confer an eternal benefit, if the communion of his very essence be not united with it. The element and aliment, however, with and through which Christ gives eternal life is not merely his eternal and divine essence which, from the day of creation, is life-creating, but also his human essence, which has since his incarnation been permeated with the former, or his flesh, which he gives for the life of the world which through sin has incurred the penalty of death. John 6: 51. It is this flesh together with its blood, the flesh and blood of a sinful race, which he has assumed and which in death he has offered up as an atoning sacrifice, and afterwards exalted to a higher and eternal life, which must also be received, appropriated and partaken of by those for whom it was given, and to whom it is to give eternal life, and that because it is itself a *pneumato-somatic* being both in a spiritual and bodily manner. As we have inherited from the first Adam his sin, guilt and death and, therefore, his entire *pneumato-somatic* being, so also shall, inversely, pass over to us from the second Adam his grace, righteousness and life, with his divine human essence, and consequently his glory shall also be revealed in and on us. It is a well founded remark by Chemnitz *Fundamenta Sacros. Cocne* Cap. XI: Christus non tantum ipse assumpsit nostram naturam, sed illam etiam nobis rursus restituit, ut hoc nexu *communicetur* a nobis et nobis rursus *communicetur* humanitatis

suæ subvehat nos ad communionem et communicationem cum ipsa divinitate.\*) According to this Christ has not only assumed our flesh and blood in the womb of Mary, in order thereby to render satisfaction in our stead by his sufferings and death, and then, being glorified, exalt it to the participation and communion of his Divine glory, but he will also make us partakers of that human essence, which through him has been perfectly sanctified, renewed and glorified, and perpetuates its communion, together with all the benefits connected with it, to all Christians who, as the people of the second Adam, belong to his family, and in this way bring about continually their essential union with God and secure to them eternal life. They are not only to behold the glory which had been given him, and which essentially consists in the glorification of his human nature by the Divine, but they are also to receive it from him as a gift, so that they may be one with him according to the human nature, as he is one with the Father according to the Divine nature, John 17: 24.

The question which here consequently concerns us is, whether the spiritual properties, merits and blessings, which descend from the God-man Jesus to the human family, are only such as are also derived from other great and holy men, or whether he, as its new head and father, also communicates and perpetuates his bodily essence among its members. Not as if the essence was to be considered separate from those attributes and blessings, but also not inversely. Marriage is essentially a bond of love, fidelity and sacred bliss and therefore of a spiritual nature, for which reason it is also so frequently employed, in the Sacred Scriptures, as an analogy to that union, which exists between the Lord and his Church; yet it is, notwithstanding, not merely a spiritual, but also a bodily union, and is based not simply upon a union in love of the spirit, but also on that of the flesh and blood, by which the united life of the parents is continued and perpetuated in the children to new spiritual and bodily forms. A spiritual without a bodily union constitutes as little a marriage and family bond, as does a bodily without that spiritual which also animates the body. There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling,

\*Compare Crystostom's 45th, Homily on the Gospel of St. John Chap. 6.



Eph. 4: 4. As this was the fundamental law of the original creation of the human family in Adam, so also is it the principle in its redemption and restoration in Christ. Adam has communicated to his posterity the whole of human nature; Christ has assumed the whole of human nature, and just as he has assumed it, so also does he communicate it, for he is the Redeemer and renewer of it entire. As erroneous as it would be to say, that Adam had only transmitted his body to his descendants, equally erroneous would it be to maintain, that Christ communicates to his people only his spiritual and not also his bodily life, and that these accordingly are indeed connected with the old Adam, both spiritually and bodily, but with the new Adam only spiritually. If this was so, then would the Holy Spirit, since the day of Christ's ascension be the only Mediator and Saviour of mankind, and Christ would only form with the Spirit of the Church one spirit, but not one body with its body; and that he became flesh would only be something entirely past, but no living presence, because he is no longer present to his Church.

The most important testimony from the lips of our Lord against any and every division\* of his divine-human personally, and against all spiritualistical separation from the communication also of his bodily essence with us, is to be found in the discourse which he addressed to the people after the miraculous feeding, and which is not less miraculous than the miracle itself. John 6.† In striking contrast with the bread which he himself provided, as well as with the manna which under Moses had rained from heaven, he calls himself the bread of eternal life from heaven, designating this bread expressly as his flesh, which he was to give for the life of the world (v. 51), not indeed as separated, spiritless, dead flesh, which would profit nothing (v. 63), but his flesh filled and permeated with spirit and life by the life-giving Spirit from God. (v. 63). In Christ neither the spirit is to be separated from the flesh, nor the flesh from the spirit. Nothing but the concrete, the whole Christ, as manifested in the flesh, is

\*Non autem dimidiatus tandem Christus, aut una duntaxat ipsius pars ecclesiæ præsto est, sed toto Christi persona; ad eam autem pertinent ambæ naturæ, divina et humana. Form. Con. p. 783.

†Compare among the more modern commentators Scheidel (the Lord's Supper) Breslau, 1823, p. 241 ss.; especially Stier's Words of Jesus, Vol. II. p. 311 ss.; and Kahnis on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Leipzig 1851, p. 104 ss.

the true Christ. 1 John 4: 3, s. : 5: 20. Only as God-man is he the Saviour of mankind, renewing by his Spirit, not only our spirits, but by his flesh also our flesh. He has assumed our entire nature with soul and body, not to present it only once as a sacrifice, and then again re-assume it in its glorified state, and in this state retain it for himself alone. He rather desires to communicate and impart it continually to his people as meat and drink of eternal life; for his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed, and whoso eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood abideth in him and hath eternal life, and shall be raised by him with a body like unto his own glorious body (Phil. 3: 21), at the last day, v. 53-58.

The most decisive proof that the Lord, in his discourse after the feeding of the multitude, spoke of a feast still greater and more miraculous, that he intended to say something new, something extraordinary and, consequently, something till then unheard of, and especially promise the essential communication and participation of himself, of his bodily essence, is to be found in the feeling of incredulous and indignant surprise, with which his hearers were struck, and to which they gave utterance in the words (v. 60): This is a hard saying, who can hear it. It was on this account, too, that many of those, who had hitherto professed to be his disciples left him. v. 66. The indubitable fidelity of the narration finds its voucher continually in the fact, that Christ's words still produce the same impression on the minds of those who read them, which they originally produced on the minds of those who heard them. They appear to them in their literal sense so exceedingly hard, that they will not receive them, but mollify and weaken them in a way, which transcends the utmost limits of astonishment at the superficiality of a comprehension which is anything but profound. According to them the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ is to signify nothing more, than the receiving by *faith* those spiritual benefits which he has wrought out for us, by the surrender of himself on the cross, or in general, the believing reception of Christ in our souls. It is true, the Lord says in the preceeding verses, 35, 40, 47, concerning faith in him, what he afterwards declares in reference to the eating of his flesh, namely, that he who believeth in him hath eternal life. But it is also true, as the taste of the mouth is indispensable to the enjoyment of the food of which we partake, so also is the faith in the Lord indispensable to

the subjective possession and conscious enjoyment of salvation ; yet as taste can on that account not render food unnecessary, so also can subjective faith not render unnecessary, the objective gift, or, in general, the reception, the corresponding communication. It rather appears, that both will ever remain equally necessary ; for it would certainly be very preposterous in those who are betrothed, never to enter upon marriage, or consummate an actual union, simply because their betrothal already rendered them happy by faith. If the soul could be content without the body, or faith without the substance, the Lord would surely have acquiesced, and not, as he did afterwards, rendered conspicuous, with specific and repeated emphasis, the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood as necessary to eternal life. If this, which according to the text must evidently be added to faith as an essential enhancement of the union with Christ, or which is designated, not as a figurative but real eating, were nothing more than a mere figurative paraphrasing of faith, then indeed would the figurative elucidation be far more difficult to understand, than the thing itself, and therefore exceedingly wide of the mark. Moreover, it is but reasonable to suppose, that after the hardness and obscurity of his figurative saying had given such manifest offence, Christ, in order to remove its cause, would have gone back to the simple and more obvious idea of faith. Such, however, is not the case ; Jesus only meets the astonishment of his disciples at his words with a reference to the sublime miracle of his ascension, which is the most glorious exaltation of his human essence. v. 62. And it is precisely by this allusion that he intimates to them, that he does not intend to feed his disciples with his unglorified, spiritless and dead body, nor with separate parts of it, but that he would communicate to them the substance, which, through the glorifying power of God, was as living, as it was life-giving, and thus unite himself essentially with them. According to this the wonderful saying of our Lord preserves its truthfulness and essentiality, and in doing so loses every thing of a repulsive and cruel nature, which could only attach to it, where the idea of dismembering the body or taking the life of one beloved could associate with it. Apart from this, the idea of one being, as living upon and enjoying another, is far from being repugnant, but on the contrary, something very delightful. We live and move and have our being in God ; the child lives in and of the mother and grows, and drinks from her breast ; and those united in marriage belong

to each other with heart and mouth, soul and body. Were the fruit-bearing tree, the vine, a living being, how willingly would it not offer the fainting its fruit, its clusters for refreshment! Christ lives and dies henceforth no more; he is the tree of life, the living and true vine, whose branches spread in every direction, whose grapes grow everywhere, and who yields his wine to the refreshing of all who have been received into his vineyard. He is the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, and his Church, is the second Eve, the mother of the living, who says concerning her Lord: Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth: for his love is better than wine. Song of Sol. 1: 1. For no one ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church, for we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they too shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and His Church. Eph. 5: 29-32. As assuredly as the apostle does not here speak abstractly of a mere spiritual bond, just as assuredly does Christ, John 6: 51-58, not treat of a mere spiritual partaking or a reception simply by faith of himself, but, also of a bodily partaking, by which we become members of his body; and as true as is the declaration, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, yet without sin," just as true is the declaration, after he has imparted of flesh and blood without sin, we must also become partakers of the same from him, or we are not children of the new generation, and his incarnation would, without a continual communication and communion, be indeed an important, but only a historical incident in redemption, not however—a perpetual element of it, but for the present unproductive.\* The comparison of the union subsisting between Christ and his Church with the marriage union would not hold good, and especially what is said in Eph. 5: 30, "for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones,"† would be utterly untrue.

Great is the mystery of the incarnation, and great the mystery of the union of the God-man with his church and its members; but however great it may be, it is incontrovertibly

\*Compare Schneckenburger's Christ's twofold state.

†See Harless' Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, in reference to this passage. Erlangen, 1834. He considers it as referring to the Holy Supper.



certain, that agreeably to the *pneumato-somatic* Person of the Lord, this union is not only a spiritual, but also a bodily union. The words of our Saviour spoken John 6, after the feeding of the multitude, afford a most incontestible proof. It is true, he gives us as yet no explanation as to how and by what means the feeding with the body and blood of the Lord is to be brought about and accomplished, but simply maintains its profitableness and necessity, and points to it as something yet future. v. 51. One of its benefits, however, he mentions particularly, namely, that it saves from death even after death, and preserves eternal life till the resurrection on the last day, v. 50 s. 53 s. 57 s. This was confessedly by the Fathers for the most part understood as meaning, that the body of the Lord received by us implanted into our perishable bodies an undying substance, a resurrection element, which does indeed not now, but which will hereafter, on the day of the general resurrection attain in the newly risen body to a full and life sustaining development. It must, however be assumed, that this more excellent body, which we have received from the Lord is of advantage to the soul even before this time, namely, at its departure from the body of this death, as its element of life, in order to afford its essence an essential support, to cover its nakedness and to ground itself in that building of God, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, 2 Cor. 5: 1 s., in the temple of the body of Christ, the risen One (John 2: 21 s.), with whom Paul longed to be at home, 2 Cor. 5: 8. Not as if the departed soul had no life and being without such a union with Christ. It indeed has, but according to the condition of its old being and body, not a salutary, healthy and loving life, but an unhealthy and feverish one, either shaking with cold and pining for warmth, or being consumed amid the heat of passion and longing for a cooling draught. Matt. 9: 12; Luke 16: 24. It is the realized communion of love with Christ alone which preserves the soul, which is at home with him (2 Cor. 5: 8), in a salutary and blessed life, preserves it in a glorified being with Christ, united and hidden with Christ in God, until it, when Christ, its life, shall again visibly manifest himself in his divine-human glory, shall be revealed with him in a newly raised and visible body in glory, Col. 3: 3 s. Then will he change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself (Phil. 3: 21); then too will he particularly as-



simulate those to himself in whom he has before had his seed and being, 1 John 3: 2.

Christ is our righteousness, Jer. 33: 16, our peace, Eph. 2: 14, our life, Phil. 1: 21. It is self-evident that, wherever the animated being or the living substance is to be found, there also are imparted the inhering qualities and attributes, and that, according to this, where the body and blood are received, there also are grace, forgiveness of sin, love, life and salvation imparted with it.\* This, it is true, is done, in itself, already by the means of grace, namely, the word, just as men are able to give assurance among one another of their love merely in words. But are they on that account not also to prove their love by actions? Or is it only to be confined to the verbal declaration, without the privilege of shaking hands, kissing and embracing? Who will prevent the Lord from giving us more than his word of promise? Who will dispute his right to give to us not only his grace, righteousness and love, but with these also his life's pain, his glorified body, Divine (ambrosial) food, and give us to drink of the wine of his precious blood, which confers immortality, so that we may be altogether one with him? And who will presume to say, that he, together with his reconciling love, does not thus communicate and unite himself to his people more completely, more intimately and in a manner more profitable unto eternal life, than with the simple words? And if this very Word assures us, that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed, and when he calls upon us in the Holy Supper to take and eat, this is my body given for you, take and drink this is my blood shed for you, who will dare indulge in unhappy doubts.

Doubts, however, have been raised in reference to this very question, namely, whether Christ, in his discourse, recorded in John 6, treats of the Holy Supper at all. He of course does not treat in this passage of the sacramental enjoyment of his body and blood under the consecrated bread and wine in as much as he, on that occasion, neither instituted nor distributed it; neither could he have done so,

\*Compare Luther's Sermon on Confession and the Sacrament, W. Vol. XI. p. 816 and 842 s. See also Vol. XX. p. 1057: "Where Christ remains to me, there everything else shall remain and be found." The Lord who gives himself to us, is himself the living pledge of all his benefits. The Father gives us all things in and with the Son, Rom. 8: 32. Compare on the separation of justification from the communication of life, Schneckenburger's Christ's two-fold State, p. 135.

because he had not yet offered up his body as the paschal lamb of the new covenant for the life of the world, John 6: 51; 1 Cor. 5: 7, nor glorified it for food of communication and communion. This was done only in the night, in which he was betrayed, and subsequently offered up, John 13: 31. Justly, therefore, our older theologians, from Luther down, in their strict exegetical consistency declined, however much at first view it seemed to recommend itself, to deduce evidence from John 6, in proof of the presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine of the Holy Supper, not merely because such presence is fully established on other grounds, but because, in the case of the Supper all depends upon the words which the Lord employs in his testament concerning *bread and wine*, species of the sacrament, which here do not yet present themselves. That the discourse in John 6, in general refers to something yet unfulfilled, to something future, must be conceded even by those who, in opposition to its literal sense, conceive only a spiritual reception of Christ's spiritual benefits, in as much as these benefits were, at that time, not completed and the work of his redemption not yet finished. So also do we explain these words, namely, as they refer to a future offering (8. v. 51) of his body and blood upon the cross, so also do they refer to a future communication of them as meat and drink indeed for his disciples (v. 53 ss.), which he promises to them as certain and indispensable, and as proving fruitful to eternal life unto all who shall believably receive them. When and how, with what and in what such food is to be provided and presented, what natural means and physical organs he is to appoint for the communication as well as for the reception of the supernatural gift, and in how far, therefore, that supersensuous enjoyment may be accommodated to our senses, and its benefits may be destroyed by unbelief—of all this Jesus says, John 6, as yet nothing; for he treats here chiefly of the invisible essence of that living enjoyment, and not at all of its outward, visible form. We are, therefore, still at liberty to suppose, that the Lord will effect this in more ways than one, in the life that now is or in that which is to come. Yet we must, at the same time, confess that, whilst for himself, he is neither confined to the water in baptism, nor to bread and wine in the Holy Supper, he has yet bound us, and for us, has bound himself, through the sacramental institution, in such a way, that we, in his Church on earth, must receive his body and blood orally, there only, where

he himself has placed them for us, and where he, being present, gives them to us, namely, in the elements of the sacrament of the Holy Communion. The miraculous feeding of the multitude, together with the discourse of our Lord which succeeded it, is to us a significant type of the Holy Supper which, however, having at that time not been prepared, is also not defined in the discourse, but only prophetically pointed at, especially in v. 51. The settled (anti-spiritualistic) inference which we finally draw from this discourse is, that Christ's flesh is meat indeed, and Christ's blood is drink indeed for the members of his body, and is designed for us as food for eternal life. But how he realizes this miraculous feeding within the sanctuary of his Church, whose present and not absent high-priest he is, and how he communicates the holy sacrifice of himself and makes us partakers of his glory, this we can learn only of him, out of his own mouth, in the institution and sacramental appointment of his Holy Supper, in humility and in the obedience of faith.

*2. Concerning the institution of the Holy Supper for the Communion of the glorified Body and Blood of Christ.*

*(a) The time when instituted.*

In the night, in which our Lord Jesus Christ, after having for the last time eaten the Old Testament Passover with his disciples, *was betrayed* for thirty pieces of silver, he instituted, in a divinely glorious manner, the sacrificial feast of the New Testament, in which he gives himself, under the consecrated bread and wine, to his disciples as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, offering his life for the redemption of the many, so that, justified from their sins, they might be one in him, and partake of the glorification of his human nature through the divine glory, John 17 : 22-24. Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, says Paul 1 Cor. 5 : 7 ; *i. e.* slain and offered for us upon the cross, stained with his blood, and gratefully received by us in the Holy Supper, which he himself instituted in the night in which he was betrayed. The four accounts of the institution of the Holy Supper, which are in essential agreement with each other, bring it into immediate connection with the betrayal by Judas Iscariot, whom Satan had hardened, Luke 22 : 3 ss., John 13 : 2, 27. The first two Evangelists, Matt. 26 and John 14, only mention, in their account of the last meal which Jesus ate with his Apostles, the be-

trayal by one of their number, immediately after which the words of institution follow, and then they only give his parting declaration, "I will not drink henceforth of this cup of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Paul, who in 1 Cor. 11, only records the words of institution which he had received from the Lord, still adds, *in the night in which he was betrayed*. It is clear, that in these several accounts there is not a mere fortuitous or external co-incidental agreement in point of time, but an inner causative agreement. The accomplishment of the hellish betrayal, the commencement of the deliverance of Christ into the hands of the unjust, is the beginning of his being offered up. But as he says in reference to his life, no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself (John 10: 18), it was *for*, when the betrayal began, not only to permit it to take place, passively, but at once also to meet it, by presenting himself before his disciples as a free-will offering for the sins of the world, and really to consecrate now body and blood, as an offering on behalf of his people. There was met the greatest sin by the greatest grace, the most wicked act of the devil, by the most holy act of God, the enmity of Satan, by the mercy of Christ, hellish cunning by heavenly wisdom, which brings the greatest good out of the greatest evil. The announcement of his betrayal, therefore, forms the introduction to the institution of the holy sacrificial feast which, in the New Testament, takes the place of the sacrifice which commemorated the deliverance out of the bondage of Egypt, and which was to place all the members of the new covenant in connection with its head. It is therefore well established that the announcement which so greatly afflicted and humiliated the disciples precedes, in the gospels of Matthew and Mark, the, in its turn, again elevating and comforting institution of the sacrament. This arrangement must be preferred to that of Luke, who lets the announcement of the betrayal, chap. 22: 21, follow after the words of institution by way of supplement, so much the more so, because, other sayings uttered by our Saviour at the last supper recorded by him, have not, on the whole, any internal connection and appear one and all to be subordinated to the principle subject, namely, the words of institution of the sacrament. Neither can it be supposed that the Lord would, after the first communion, disturb or obliterate the profound and comforting impression made upon his disciples by it, by announcing to them that there was a be-

prayer among their own number, which could not but have sorely distressed and humiliated them. If we, therefore, follow the order, observed by the two evangelists, of whom Matthew also mentions, immediately after the announcement, Judas as the betrayer, chap. 26: 25, it also follows of necessity from John 13: 30, that the betrayer here mentioned, went away immediately after having received the sop, and that after this his excommunication,\* by which the ban of his diabolical presence was removed, the institution of the holy communion took place. The words of institution do, however, not follow in John as they do in Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul, where they are recorded in essential agreement with each other, simply because they were in their fixed form already at that time the common property of the Church. Yet John gives where the words of institution ought to be introduced, immediately after the mention of the going out of the *betrayer in the night*, (13: 30) in the night in which he was betrayed, 1 Cor. 11: 23, the words of our Saviour, which serve as a solemn introduction to them, v. 31 s., now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified *in him*. If God be glorified *in him*, God shall also glorify him *in himself*, and shall straightway glorify him. With these words of Christ, pronounced in the most direct consciousness of the glorifying presence and dwelling of God was to be connected, rather than with any other passage in John, without further parenthesis, the self-glorifying word of the institution of the sacrament, *and he took the bread, gave thanks,† brake it, &c.* This the greatest proof of resigning, sympathizing, uniting love, which the Lord gives and imparts to his people in the holy communion, as he departs from them according to his temporal corporeality, is very aptly followed by the tender expressions, such as, little children, yet a little while I am with you, &c., and a new

\*From this excommunication the un-evangelical deduction must, by no means, be drawn, that the communion ought not to be administered to poor sinners, but only to complete and holy disciples. How little the disciples were deserving of these predicates at the first Supper, the Lord himself witnesses with regard of all by saying: Ye shall all be offended because of me this night, Matt. 26: 31, and to Peter in particular, v. 34. But on the other hand, had the Satanic betrayer not been excluded from the holy communion, no other excommunication could ever take place.

†Analogous to the looking up to God before the miraculous feeding, Matt. 14: 19, and before the raising of Lazarus, by which was manifested the glory of God, John 11: 40-43.



commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you, v. 33 s.

It is certainly worthy of attention, that in the same place, where in the other evangelists we find the betrayal by Judas in immediate connection with the institution of the Holy Supper, we find in John a witness by Christ in reference to God being glorified in him, which he uttered on that night, at the moment, when the betrayer had gone out to deliver him into the hands of his enemies, John 13: 31. Whatever may be said in regard to the above explanation of this connection, it is still impossible to invalidate this clear and explicit testimony concerning the institution of the communion of the body and blood of Christ under the consecrated bread and wine, which belongs to his glorification and which took place in the same night. It is indeed surprising how, in opposition to this testimony, the objection could have been urged, Jesus could in that night not have given his glorified body and blood, because not yet glorified,\* though he himself declares most expressly, now is the Son of man glorified (*νῦν ἰδοὺ καὶ γλῶριάζω*) and God is glorified in him. When immediately after he continues, If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorify him in himself (*ὁ θεὸς καὶ αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ*) and shall straightway glorify him, v. 32, he distinguishes the glorification of God in the Son of man, which is just now taking place, from the glorification of the Son of man in God, which was to take place soon after. This belongs to his exaltation, and is an intensified glorification of the Son of man into the majestic glory of God: whilst the former, still belongs to his humiliation, is the condescending glorification of the glory of God in the form as a servant of the Son of man, full of grace and truth. Such a condescending glorification, corresponding to the gentler manifestations of his glory in the miracles of grace, and culminating in that perfect love which is great in serving, giving and resignation, meets us on the last night in which he was betrayed, and in which he instituted the sacrament of the communion. The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and give his life a ransom for many; these words find their fulfilment especially on the sacred night of the institution of the Holy Supper. I am among you as he that serveth saith the Lord, Luke 22: 27; John 13: 13 s.; and comes with water, to purify and

\*See Ebrard's *Dogma of the Holy Supper*. Frankfort, 1845. Vol. I. p. 109.

sanctify his disciples, whilst washing their feet, yea comes still closer to form an essential union with them, by glorifying for them, as his little children, John 13: 33, with more than maternal resignation, the substance of his flesh and blood as food for eternal life. *Now is the Son of man glorified and God is glorified in him.* Surely this is no figurative or typical expression, no poetic fancy (αλλοιωσις; this is grace and truth: this is a great reality of Divine love, an unquestionable evidence of a real communication of Divine life and attributes to the human nature of the Son of man which permeated by it and permeating even its own natural limits, now also mediates, communicates and distributes unseen the life and immortality which it has received. The time of such glorification, after the son of perdition, into whom the Prince of darkness had entered, had gone out to betray his Master, the point of time at which the offering up of Christ begins, and from which his suffering, death and departure take their date is, therefore, just as prominently established, as it tends to our establishment. The hour has now come in which his promise, John 6: 51, is being fulfilled, *the bread that I will give (to eat) is my flesh*, which I will give (as a sacrifice) *for the life of the world*; now, on this holy night, is the time when he makes his testament (Heb. 9: 15), bequeathing to believers in the sacrament of thankful devotion, the treasures of his grace together with his continual gracious presence; now is the time in which he seals the new testament, the new covenant in his blood, by making the members of the covenant, the apostles, who represented the whole Church, partakers of his blood in the cup of the covenant, and by receiving them, through the bread of blessing, into the communion of his body, and by commanding them to do the same in future.

(b) Concerning the bread.

Therefore, conscious of his glorification, and conscious also that God was glorified in him, and feeling his soul, body and blood, interwoven with its wonderful power, and recognizing himself, at the same time, whilst seated at the table of the passover, as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and gives it life, Jesus took the bread, gave thanks, brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, *Take and eat, this is my body.* We will first consider this passage by itself, as recorded in Matthew and Mark. These words, which

are as definite as they are pregnant, and which connect\* by the simple copula bread and the body of Christ, have been so thoroughly examined in every respect, exegetically as well as grammatically, and at the same time with a glance at the exposition of the fathers (compare Kalms on the dogma concerning the Lord's Supper, p. 179 ss.) and the true sense of the substantives as well as the copula has been so comprehensively and thoroughly discussed and established, both by ancient as well as by more modern theologians, that the attempt, to offer anything new, would be a vain presumption. We will therefore, only confine ourselves to the task of proving, that the glorification of our Lord throws, in an essential point of view, not a little light upon these most important words.† Even though Christ had, on that night, not referred to his gentler glorification, the words of institution would still force us to explain them, as relating to his body in a glorified state, because it could not at all be said of the unglorified, natural, material and confined body, take *eat*, this is my body. Such an eating could neither be taken in a real (supernatural) sense, as a mortiferous dismemberment of Christ's flesh, nor in a signifiatory sense, because it would be equally monstrous to imagine, in the form of bread, the natural compact body figuratively, and then to eat it up, commemoratively in energy; for a figurative memorial ought rather to be preserved. It must be borne in mind, that the Lord is still externally present among his disciples with his visible body, at the institution of the Supper, whilst his essence consecrated to them, discloses and glorifies itself to them from within, for a communication and communion. It is the energy of the divine glorification of his human nature, through which the holy body of Christ surrounds itself dynamically, with the invisible emanations and emanations of his essence, which as yet, he keeps veiled, but which he also permits to become visible in his glorious exaltation at the right hand of the

\*This copula has, as is well known, the same copulative and communicative sense in those sentences which denote the unity between the Godhead and humanity in Christ, or the relation of the word to its spirit and import (as for instance, John 6: 63, Rom. 1: 16,) or even the twofold nature of him, according to which both natures are imparted to him, neither of them figuratively, but both in like literalness, viz: that he is earth and flesh, (Gen. 3: 19; 6: 3,) as well as a living soul, Gen. 2: 7.

†See the most excellent Communion-book, by Kapff, 6 Ed. Stuttg. 1851, §15.

father as a cloud of glory. The very same body which is first to be given for his people as a bloody sacrifice, and then become a new and eternally glorified body, he designs to communicate to them in a holy mystery of love, for an essential communion with him the Head, which assimilates its members to itself. This he does by offering to them, for their participation, the visible consecrated bread, with the words, *This is my body*, in an invisible, imponderable, miraculous manner, by surrounding and permeating the consecrated food, which he touches with his hands and blesses by the word of his mouth, with that invisible breath or emanation and influence of the glorified substance of his body, and thus exalting it into communion with it. Therefore he, the true witness (Rev. 3 : 14,) who, in the making of his testament, certainly employs no equivocal figurative language, and in whom all types and shadows are embodied (Col. 2 : 17.) says, in perfect, real verity concerning the broken bread, whilst abrogating and changing its previous natural designation, *Take, eat, this is my body*. Yea, verily, what he bids them now to eat is what he, the Lord, the All-powerful says it is, namely, his body, his true body; because he, in whom all the fulness of the God-head dwells bodily, mysteriously fills and fructifies it with the true, most intensive, or most essential essence of his body. In such a dynamical communicative manner then is the consecrated bread the body of Christ. Herein is also contained a refutation of the assertion, that only a detached piece, a small fragmentary part of the body of Christ, can be present in the bread and not his whole essence, which fanatics of reason declare absolutely impossible. Luther, in his sermon on the sacrament against the fanatics says, in reference to this comminuting view, and in answer to the objection founded upon it, very aptly, W. vol. XX p. 930, "If they would only properly examine a little seed or a cherry, these might teach them *more*," for in the little seed is contained the entire plant. Those who object, that such little seeds, such essential elements of life in the byzard are not perceptible by the senses, and therefore, also not real and operative, should well consider, how imperceptible these imponderable potencies or substances are, which exert an influence upon the physical health of man, and how powerful, nevertheless, their influence is. The consecrated bread is therefore the body of Christ, because as the vehicle of his communication of it, it is inherently participant of and essentially participates in it, as Paul testifies, when he 1 Cor

10: 16, explains the words of institution by paraphrasing them: *the bread we brake is the communion* (*κοινωνία*, *communio*, *participatio*) *of the body of Christ, and the cup which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ*; or as the Church expresses it, Christ's body and blood is in, with and under the bread and wine.\*

It is also clear and indisputable from what Paul says, that the institution of the Holy Supper, of the Lord which he reports as having received from the Lord (1 Cor. 11: 23 ss.) in language as strong and solemn as that employed by the evangelists, possesses and ever will possess the same power of blessing and communication after, as it possessed before Christ's ascension, when he was yet visibly present among his disciples, though, already, temporary in a higher state of glorification. But now being in his state of exaltation he partakes also of the highest glorification, and is, at the right hand of the father, limited neither by space nor time, and *can*, therefore, execute his high-priestly testament, in his Church, at all times and in all places, really and truly, as he *wills* it, according to his word.† The bread, which his servants consecrate, by repeating over it his testamentary words, is therefore, at present, what it was at the time of the apostles, his body, because it has and is the communion of his body. How poor would we be, how empty would appear the Lord's Supper, if he, the principal personage, should be wanting at his table, if he had only been essentially present at its institution, but was now removed from it, as far as heaven is distant from earth, and would leave us to celebrate the marriage feast without the bridegroom, without bodily communion with him.

The bread of the holy communion cannot be the body of Christ, in any other way, than by the holy communion of this body with it, which on the part of the Lord depends actively upon the *communication* of his essence with the bread, and on the part of the bread, passively upon its *participating* in the essence of the Lord. The bilateral word *κοινωνία* expresses both united, and in consequence of this union between Christ's body and the bread, *which we brake*, still a third is expressed, namely, that the bread mediates our communion with the body of the Lord, which it could not do, if itself had no communion with it. Only through this is it in

\*See Form. of Concord. De Coena Domini, p. 735.

†See for proof our Article on Christ's exaltation.



the sacrament of communion the body of the Lord, also making all, who receive it, partakers of this one body, 1 Cor. 10: 17,\* just as he who partakes of the passover, enters, by so doing, into an essential communion with the altar and the sacrifice upon it. v. 18 ss. comp. Matth. 20: 23. The bread cannot be, or become the body, the true body of Christ and establish communion with it, by having its substance changed or transubstantiated into that of the body. For if the material of the bread was to be changed or transformed into the substance of the body of Christ, this would be a new body, formed or assumed out of the material of the bread, but not the historical, true body, born of the virgin Mary, and given for the sins of the world upon the cross; and what would then become of the essential communion with the true Christ? The advocates of transubstantiation are conscious of the difficulty. Hence they assume that the material of the bread is not actually transubstantiated in the consecration, but rather annihilated, and that then, the *accidentals*, such as form, taste, smell, weight, &c., only remaining, the substance of the body of Christ is put in the place of the substance of the bread. But according to this the body which occupies this empty semblance of a form, would either have to be created out of nothing, in which case it would again be merely the unhistorical body of the Lord, which would not stand in, nor bring it into connection with his crucified body, or it must be assumed, that this true body enters, by the communication of the living Christ, into communication and a replenishing and incorporating union with the form of bread. The first of these assumptions carries absurdity upon its very face, because it is in opposition,† not only to the words of institution which speak of the true, already present body of the Lord, but also to the essence of his holy communion. The second assumption, however, approaches nearer to our doctrine, and compels to an acknowledgement of its correctness as well as to a reception of the truths associated with it, namely, those concerning the presence and glorification of the human nature of the Lord through the *communicatio idiomatum* of the Divine, without which there is in general, no

\*The unity of the body of Christ does not only depend upon the communion of the same spirit, (1 Cor. 12: 13; Eph. 4: 4,) but also upon the same body, which is received in the bread.

†This assumption is rejected even in the Romish Catechism. See Catechism. Roman. p. II. c. 4, qu. 31.

consistent representation of the presence of the whole Christ in his Church. All that therefore really still remains to be considered, is the difference in the phraseology employed. What are denominated the accidentals of the bread, are the entire characteristics which remain even after the act of consecration has been performed. Now if it be logically true, that a combination of all the characteristics of a thing is equal to the whole, or to the idea of the thing itself, it seems the same, whether we say the substance of Christ unites itself to the bread, or it unites itself to its accidents. The Roman Catholics, however, are unfortunately unwilling to show any leaning to this our view, though ever so well and firmly established. They insist upon the transubstantiation and annihilation of the substance of the bread, though all its entire characteristics are to remain and adhere to the body of Christ only as accidental, whose substance must now be conceived of just as entirely destitute of individual characteristics, as the characteristics of the bread must be conceived of without proper substance (predicates without a subject.)\* Both, the transubstantiation of the essence, as well as the annihilation of the earthly element contradicts the internal connection or *analogy of faith*, which throughout requires a loving union (*unio* and *communio*) of the heavenly and earthly, and regrets the changing or transubstantiation of the one into the other, just as *monophysitical* as the mere presence of the earthly in appearance is *doe tic*. Though there are evidences in the 1 chap. of the B session of the council of Trent, of an approach to our doctrine concerning the sacramental union (*unio sacramentalis*) of Christ with the earthly elements of the Supper, transubstantiation, is nevertheless positively maintained in chap. 4, as *conversio totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus*, according to which we behold in the sacrament nothing but a new or added body of Christ, produced by the transformation of the bread, or a bread sublimated to be his body, and in which is received, not so much the glorified Son of man, as the glorified bread of man; not so much the glorified substance of Christ, as the glorified transubstantiated substance of the bread. The earthly element is thereby exalted and potenti-

\*The Catechismus Romanus, p. II. c. 4, qu. 37, represents it as a great miracle (*supra omnem naturæ ordinem*) that the predicates of the bread can exist by themselves without their subject (*sine aliqua ipsa se sustentent*). Verily a great miracle of logic.

ated upward to the heavenly, much more than the heavenly lets itself down to the earthly, glorifying and imparting glorification to it, and the body of the Lord appears rather receptively increasing and receiving, than actively communicating and imparting itself. All this stands, of course, in intimate connection with that Catholic view concerning the eucharist, according to which it is to be more a sacrifice offered by men from below, than a gift of God bestowed from above, more an odor of the earth, than a dew from heaven, more an officium, than a beneficium, more a sacrificium, than a sacramentum. In what connection the bread which, through the sacrificing priest, is changed into the body of Christ, stands with the Christ who, according to his bodily essence, has been exalted to the right hand of God, and how it is in general connected with the presence of Christ in his Church, —concerning this the Tridentine theology, has formed no internally connected idea, but contents itself with disdainfully rejecting our own. It is on this account principally they tie the essence of Christ in heaven (juxta modum existendi naturalem, Sess. XIII c. 1.) just as much locally to his seat at the right hand of God, as it cleaves on earth to the transubstantiated bread, so that, in general, the essential presence of Christ is only recognized and shut up within such separated circumscription, and here only within this narrow material form (and that often only in pyxide,) in which only it is adored. The attempt is indeed made to escape the limitation connected with these views, by maintaining that there are indeed not merely fragmentary parts of the essence of Christ present in these shadows of bread and wine, but the whole and complete (totus et integer) Christ, God and man indivisibly in each of these shadowy forms. It is, however, impossible to let this entire divine human presence proceed only from the substance of bread and wine, and to include (contineri) it in their remaining semblance, without an approach to blasphemy; but in order to be assured of his essential presence, we must go back to the *self communication* of the living glorified Christ, from which men should never have departed.

The monstrous idea, that the entire substance of the bread and wine, are transubstantiated into the entire substance of the humanity and, therefore, also into the divinity of Christ, must vanish before the truth of our doctrine, according to which the bread is the body of Christ through the penetrating communication of the essential presence of the God-man.

which is not shut up in it, but surrounds that which penetrates, as radii surround a centre. According to this view an insignificant material substance is not puffed up by our own high-flown thoughts, as being the entire, great and adorable Christ; but the entire Christ collects and concentrates the radii of his essential presence in the insignificant bread, with Divine condescension,\* in order thereby to manifest himself to his little ones on earth, or to give himself to them, wholly as their own, in the manna of the holy communion. Thus also is the small pupil of the human eye not too small, to concentrate within itself the light of heaven and earth;† and how small is, according to the poet “earth’s little O” compared to the heavenly orb above us, which scatters his rage everywhere upon it. How much such condescension of the Divine glory, such gracious manifestation of the greatness of God, in that which is small, accords with the analogy of the Divine manifestations in general; concerning this we refer the reader to our meditations on that subject, in which it is clearly shown, that in all such manifestations a change of the earthly substance into the Divine essence never takes place, nor is the latter ever shut up in the former, but only glorified by permeating it.‡ It is an indwelling, which is at the same time a surrounding, a communication, by which the earthly does not shine in its own light, but in that which is communicated to it. The bread and wine become glorified not through a glory which proceeds out of themselves, but through a glory which shines around and whose rays penetrate them, and in which the presence of the Lord, like the Divine presence in the cloud reveals as well as conceals itself (*praesens latens*, as Augustine has it). As at the first Supper he was yet visibly present at his table, so also is the Lord invisibly present at every one of its subsequent celebrations, and that not only in and with, but also *under* and *over* the bread and wine, in as much as he is not only the living food, but also the personal host at his table and the high-priest at his altar, whose gifts he consecrates.

\*This is what Luther calls *praesentia definitiva*. As he also expresses it in his communion hymn, Jesus Christ our Saviour, v. 2, he gives to us his body, hid in bread so small.

†Compare Luther’s large Confession concerning the Lord’s Supper, W. Vol. XX. p. 1266 s., and Raimundi de Sabundi *Theologia naturalis*, 293.

‡Wie das Licht durchscheint das Glas.  
Und doch nicht verschret das.

blessees and distributes. The table, or altar of the New Testament must not be compared to the altar of the outer court of the Old Testament, on which were laid the bloody sacrifices, but to the altar of incense (altar of prayer, Luke 1 : 10 ; Rev. 5 : 8 ; 8 : 3) within the holy place, with the candlestick\*) and the table of shew-bread and vessel of wine at its side, near the concealed Most Holy place whose veil is not impenetrable. It has been drawn aside, since the eternal high-priest Jesus has, by his own blood, entered within the invisible and eternal holy of holies, and has seated himself as dispenser of the Divine gifts on the mercy seat at the right hand of the throne of the majesty (Heb. 8 : 1 s.), whose train fills heaven and earth, and especially the temple. (Isaiah 6 : 1).

Now whenever the Holy Supper is celebrated within the sanctuary of his Church, into which we have the boldness to enter by the blood of Christ, and when, whilst the holy, holy, holy of the seraphim is sung, the mysterious veil of the exalted holy of holies is drawn aside, and he, the high-priest of his house, who does not dwell afar off, only at the goal above, but prepares himself to us for a new and living way, which he has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his glorified flesh, (Heb. 10 : 19, 20), he comes and blesses the bread and wine under the prayers of his priestly servants, and by virtue of his word, *This is my body, this is my blood*, consecrates it to an essential communion of his body and blood. This he does, being efficaciously present at his holy altar, and his presence is therefore by no means only inclusively in the bread and wine, but is in general at his holy table, although he reveals here not so much his royal glory, as rather his high-priestly compassion, and is to be profoundly adored during the continuance of the Holy Supper, but especially during its reception. This is not urged upon us by an express command of the Lord as a legal duty or as an act of homage, which we are bound to render, but rather, and so much the more, by a spontaneous impulse of grateful devotion and holy reverential awe at his gracious presence, and in consequence of a profound appre-

\*The corresponding custom, to burn candles upon the altar is at all events a significant symbol justifiable on Bible grounds, and should least of all be denounced by those who regard the sacrament only as a significant symbol or typical sign. "It, at any rate, signifies light," replied on one occasion a simple-minded Lutheran to a Zwinglian opponent.



ciation of his deep condescension.\* As soon as the act of communion, which has been performed agreeably to the institution, is at an end, the high-priestly blessing of its mediatorial elements ceases also, because the consecratory intention is not put forth for the sake of the impersonal elements, but for sake of the living communicants.† The conclusion of the communion instituted by our Lord, discontinues, at the same time, with the ceasing of the communication of his body and blood to the communicants, also the preconditioning communication of them to the elements, which again return, as consecrated, but now empty vessels, to their natural condition, just like a mirror which reflected the sun as long as he shone upon it, becomes dark as before as soon as his light is withdrawn. Transubstantiationists, on the contrary, who maintain, that the bread is changed by a momentary creative act into the substance of Christ, regard this Christ, thus created, immanently and permanently united with the form of bread, apart from the communion and without continued communication and, in this groundless illusion, pay to it a homage, which can only be looked upon as idolatrous. In short, the doctrine of the evangelic-orthodox Church stands firm, namely, the bread which we receive in the Holy Supper is not the body of Christ, *given for us*, in consequence of a change of its entire substance into the body of Christ, but in consequence of a communication‡

\*Compare Luther, W. Vol. XIX. p. 1616 s. and Formula of Concord, p. 760.

†Upon this is based the canon : *Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo institutum.*

‡To call this communication, as some do, "consubstantiation" is unadvisable, because an intermixture of both substances might easily be inferred from it. Insubstantiation, incorporation or impanation would on the other hand too readily convey the idea of an *inclusio localis*. To regard communication less as an imparting (*Mittheilung*) of the essential presence of Christ, and more as an assumption of the elements into the communion of the essence of Christ, would not give sufficient prominence to the difference between the *unio personalis* which takes place by assumption and the *unio sacramentalis*, and not enough to the individual substantiality of the elements. The term *communicatio* or *κοινωνία*, based on 1 Cor. 10: 16 is accordingly the most suitable and theologically most correct and corresponds best of all with the name and idea of communion, which is as full of meaning, as that of the mass, both in the Latin and German languages, is unmeaning and which especially in the latter is too readily associated with the idea of a commercial transaction

communion and union (*unio sacramentalis*) of the body of Christ with the substance of the bread.

(c) Concerning the sacrifice in the Holy Supper.

The addition, which Luke and Paul make to the words, *Take and eat, this is my body*, in the words, *given or broken for you,\* do this in remembrance of me*, proves so much the more, that the question in reference to the sacramental institution, the observance of which he commanded to his Apostles for the whole future for his Church upon earth in perpetuum memoriam, is not at all concerning the production and offering up of a new body of Christ, but rather concerning the communicating of his historical body, given or offered for us on the cross, and received by us in grateful believing (eucharistic) remembrance of the wonderful benefits of the gracious and merciful Lord, (Ps. 111: 5), and in so doing we show forth his death till the day of his coming, 1 Cor. 11: 26. There, when the Lord of glory, obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, was crucified, there he has once for all finished the perfect sacrifice of reconciliation, which renders satisfaction for the sins of the whole world and which is to remain ever present to the memory of believers, and is to be continually appropriated to them anew in the sacrament.

Not that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others, but he has entered by his own blood once for all into the holy of holies in heaven, and by one offering hath perfected forever them that are sanctified, having obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. 9: 12-25; 10: 14. It is a principal design of the epistle to the Hebrews (comp. chap. 9 and 10)

\*The word *κλῶμενον* which Paul uses in 1 Cor. 11: 24 does not alter the sense, but only emphasises the violent wounding and mortal surrender of his body for us. To make *κλῶμενον*, *δεδομενον*, *ἐκχυνόμενον* refer to the distribution at the table, a sense in which even Luther at one time thought, though only interrogatively, to apply it (W. Vol. XX. p. 1330 ss.) is not admissible, already because it would then not read *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, but *ὑμεν*. That, as for the rest, the participium praesentis stands in the words of institution, is very correctly explained by Chemnitz in his *Examen Concilii Trident.* p. II. loc. VI. Art. 5, *Christus in Coena per praesent tempus locutus est; erat enim tunc in ipso actu passionis, quae consummata est in cruce.* Compare what has already been said above in reference to the betrayal. See also Stier on the Holy Supper in his "Words of Jesus (printed separately) Barmen 1855, p. 40, *διδόμενον* according to Wiener, "which is about to be given over."

to show to the people of Israel, that the many and continual expiatory sacrifices offered by the priests and high-priests of the old covenant could, by reason of the imperfection of those who offered them, not make perfect according to conscience, i. e. not provide for the complete forgiveness, righteousness and holiness, but they were only to keep them in mind of their sins, and serve as a type of their reconciliation, till in Christ the perfect high-priest should appear who, with his own body and blood, brought once, in the most holy obedience, the most perfect and eternally valid offering, and with it established in the God-man a reconciliation between God and man so complete, that no repetition of it, or further expiatory sacrifice for sin is necessary, Heb. 9: 25; 10: 10-17. That which according to the New Testament is now more especially required, is the dispensation of this complete offering to those who are to be sanctified thereby, the communication of the grace and forgiveness of sin obtained through it and the boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Christ, which was shed for and is offered to us in the cup of the new covenant, together with the body which we receive in the bread of his table; it is required, that we draw near to the mercy seat with a true heart in full assurance of *faith*, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, holding fast the profession of our faith, without wavering, being fruitful in love and good works and not forsaking the assemblies of the saints, Heb. 10: 14-24. These are the fundamental features of the evangelical Christian cultus. In whatever other passages the altar or table of Christians is mentioned, (Heb. 13: 10; 1 Cor. 10: 18-21), there we find, as we do in the words of institution, allusions to the eating of his offering, the drinking of his cup, and the sacrificial feast of his communion, but nowhere anything concerning an expiatory sacrifice first to be offered, and by which the grace of God is to be acquired. Yet notwithstanding all this, the Council of Trent, which treats separately in two sessions, separated by a long interval (Sess. XIII. and XXII.) of the *sacrament* of communion, or the eucharist and the *sacrifice* of the mass, as if they were two entirely different institutions, maintains, that that sacrament, which presupposes the grace of reconciliation and communicates it from above, is also inversely a true expiatory sacrifice (*sacrificium vere propitiatorium*), which produces grace and acquires it from below. It is true, in the 1 chap. of the 22nd session it is at first still represented as in more

intimate connection with the definition of the sacrament, laid down in the 13th session only as a commemorative offering, a bloodless representation of the bloody sacrifice on the cross, to preserve its memory to the end of the world and to apply its salutary fruit to the forgiveness of *daily sins*.\* But in the 2nd chapter the sacrifice of the mass is put on the same level with the bloody sacrifice on the cross as a true propitiatory sacrifice (*cujus oblatione placatus Dominus, gratiam et donum pœnitentia concedens, crimina et peccata, etiam ingentia, demittit*), because the same Christ is contained in it (*idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui se ipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa*). Yea it is actually placed above it, because specially to its attribute as an expiatory sacrifice is added also the sacramental attribute, according to which the benefits, flowing from the bloody sacrifice, are also plentifully to be received through the bloodless sacrifice. Hence it is not only properly offered (*rite offertur*) for the satisfaction and other necessities (*necessitatibus*) of the sins and punishments of living believers, but also for those who have died in Christ, but are still in purgatory, so that it may also satisfy for the satisfaction of Christians yet due, after the satisfaction of Christ has been received, or at least aid, in connection with other good works, in rendering satisfaction.

In opposition to these confused dogmas and confounding misinterpretations of the Holy Supper, it becomes us to state clearly and distinctly the antithesis of the evangelical truth in connection with all its previous deductions. As certainly as the Lord is more than his disciples, whom he, in the night in which he instituted his Supper, calls little children (John 13: 33); as certainly as he is more than all the servants of his Church and all men, so certainly is the holy communion not what men do at it, or bring to it (the sacrificial or sacrifice), but what the Lord does and gives and communicates at it (the sacramental, the Divine gift), and of which he says, take, eat, this is my body. We are as far from overlooking the sacrifice in the sacrament,† whose correlative it is, like gift and reciprocal gift, love and reciprocal

\*In reference to the original sin it assumed, that it has already been blotted out by baptism into the death of Christ.

†Compare the exceedingly instructive paragraph in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, *Quid sit sacrificium et quæ sint sacrificii specie*, p. 253 sqq. ed. Recheub.

love, as was our fathers. But we, as evangelical Christians, exalt the sacrament as a Divine gift above the offering as a human gift, as we do the gospel above the law, or the love with which God has loved us, above that with which we love him (1 John 4 : 10) or as we exalt, in general, the Divine above the human.\* What the nature of the sacrifice is, which connects itself with the sacrament, we will discuss hereafter. At present we will only show, that it is not an objective obligatory sacrifice or offering of works, by which God is first to be reconciled, his grace made efficient and his mercy acquired. This it cannot be, because it is already the greatest grace of the reconciled God, that the God-man gives himself to us in the earthly element for our appropriation and partaking, that he administers to us his body and blood as a Divine food, and receives us into the communion of his gracious essence. His love which does nothing but give and forgive says not, bring and offer, but *take* and eat. To attempt to requite the gratuitous gift by our gifts, and merit the inheritance of his grace by our works, where the hand, ~~you infinitely more than the Lord,~~ has already been extended from above for reconciliation, would be to abuse his condescending love, instead of gratefully accepting it. To change the pledge *to be received* into an offering *to be presented* would be to invert the sacrament; and to offer the ~~renew~~ his own testament would certainly be a perversion. It is true, the gifts we offer to God are his, but we do yet not offer them, before we have received them, and we moreover receive much more than we give. To mix both up together is to contend and weaken both, and to receive back the gift, at the moment of its bestowal, dishonors the giver. How unbecoming, therefore, must it appear, when the Father and the Son come to make their abode with us! (John 14 : 23), to send back the Son to the Father in heaven, as an expiatory offering, at the very moment, when he gives, or is about to give him to us! This is done in the canon of the mass, where immediately after the consecration the priest, instead of celebrating with the most humble gratitude the gracious presence and condescension of the All-merciful, rises and, mindful not only of the blessed sufferings and resurrection, but also of the glorious ascension of Christ,

\*This also is the sense of what the Lord says in Matt. 9 : 13, I will have mercy and not sacrifice.

†Compare Luther's Sermon on the New Testament, Walch Vol. XIX. p. 1355 ss.



offers to the glorious majesty of God a pure sacrifice of his presents and gifts, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate sacrifice,\* the sacred bread of eternal life and the cup of constant salvation,† upon which God may graciously look and accept it, as he accepts the sacrifice of Abel, Abraham and Melchisedek.‡ Consequently not one word of humble thanksgiving for the perfect gift which came from above, from the bosom of the Father, but only a presumptuous sending or lifting of it up to the Father,§ in order to obtain for it the grace of his reconciliation and other benefits. What becomes of the eucharist, of the thanksgiving?

The thanksgiving for the high and holy gift bestowed upon us by Christ is so essential in the Holy Supper, that it has received the appellation of eucharist in consequence, for which very reason it cannot be an expiatory sacrifice through which the gift of grace can first be acquired. It does not work out reconciliation for us, as an offering for works, but presents it to us as a sacrament; it does not merit it for us as a good work, but bequeathes it to us as a testament; it is not a reward for services rendered, but a marriage feast, by which the bridegroom espouses the bride, but in which he is not offered up by her. It cannot be an expiatory sacrifice because nothing of it is appropriated to God, but every one partakes of, and because it is bloodless like a meat-offering, Lev. 3: 2, whilst, according to the Scriptures, the propitiation for the people is effected only through the shedding of blood and the suffering of death Heb. 10: 11-22. The bloody suffering and death of Christ is the only perfect expiatory sacrifice, sufficient for every kind of sin: because it fulfils in

\*How sublime soever these words may sound, their weight is diminished not only by the high sacrifice being put on the same level with human sacrifices (which can only be explained as typifying Christ's sacrifice), but also and chiefly because the wafer is already presented before the consecration, immediately after the commencement of the offertorium, as immaculate hostia proinnumerabilibus peccatis, &c., and the still unconsecrated cup as pro nostra et totius mundi salute. This proves only too truly how lightly the idea of the sacrifice of propitiation is treated and in what a scandalous manner they derogate from the merit of Christ's sacrifice, Compare O. & N. T. cultus, p. 239 ss.

†Both, principaliter et finaliter appointed for us as sacramental partaking, but not as expiatory offering to God.

‡According to Chemnitz Exam. Concil. Trident. P. II. loc. VI. Art. 4. Innocent III. explains de sacre altaris mysterio the term missa thus: Sacrificium illud vocatur missa, quasi hostia a nobis transmissa Patri ut intercedat pro nobis ad ipsum.

opposition to all pleasure and selfishness of sin, and in the deepest and most painful self-denial and the most perfect obedience of the love of the Son of God, the whole law of God, in the most perfect manner (Heb. 10: 7-10), and through his merits satisfies all its requirements and cancels every one of its debts. It is finished in that awful depth of suffering, when the Son of man, suspended upon the accursed tree, felt himself forsaken of God and bowed his head, covered with wounds and blood, in sacrificial death. The Holy Supper, on the other hand, is no sacrificial suffering upon the bloody altar in the outer court, but a glorification as precious as it is holy, and a deeply mysterious importation of the life and love of Christ in the holy place. With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer, says the Lord, Luke 22: 15, and in John 13: 31 he says, Now is the Son of man glorified and God is glorified in him. The feeding of his disciples with the essence of his flesh and blood is to him not painful, but an act of pleasure, just as it is to a mother a source not of suffering, but of delight, lovingly to nourish at her own breast the child which she has brought forth in sorrow. Such tender sacrifice of love and communications of life could never have atoned for the death and hell-deserving guilt of the world. If the reconciliation of a hostile world could have been effected in so tender and painless a manner, it would have been done. Since, however, this was not possible, it has been effected on the wood of torment, where Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, in that he became a *curse* for us, so that he might become for us a *blessing* in the Holy Supper, in which his awful sacrifice on the cross is glorified and communicated to and received by us with thankfulness, consolation and peace. There occurred the death of him who made the testament, Heb. 10: 16; here the inheritance is distributed among the invited children. It is only to be received by those who have already before obtained absolution\* in repentance and confession, accordingly by those who are already children and in a state of grace, and who are only to be nourished, strengthened and blessed in it by means of the essential bread of life. Hence the Holy Supper is celebrated rather by those who are already in a state of reconciliation (*reconciliatis*), than by those yet to be reconciled (*reconciliandis*) and is therefore a truly eucharistic, but not a truly propitia-

\*Analogous to the washing of feet before the institution of the Holy Supper, John 13.

tory sacrifice. If, therefore, the Tridentium declares it to be the latter, and considers it identical with the sacrifice upon the cross, because the same Christ is present in both, the manner of presentation only being different (*sola offerendi ratio diversa*), it overlooks the fact, that notwithstanding this identity of the subject, it is nevertheless the different manner of presentation and administration which essentially distinguishes the propitiatory from the eucharistical sacrifice, as it does also from the sacrament. He is the same Christ on Easter, as on Good-Friday, the same on mount Tabor, as on Calvary. Yet he does not accomplish the expiatory sacrifice on the former, but on the latter, and, according as in his high-priestly office either the compassionate intercession or the communicating benediction, either the passion or the action predominates, so also is it determined, whether reconciliation is merited by it objectively in God, what only the death of the Lord on the cross accomplished; or whether the reconciliation already accomplished, and now offered, is thereby subjectively appropriated and received, which continually takes place in Christendom to the end of the world. To put the daily masses, performed by the priests, together with the great number of low masses by which, when celebrated without communion nothing is heard but the tinkling bell, (1 Cor. 13: 1,) on an equality with the sacrifice of Christ, which wrought out reconciliation for the whole world, as sacrificia vere propitiatoria, is nothing less than an ungrateful misapprehension of its great importance and peculiar unparalleled painful signification, and an extreme mystification of the true Evangelical design and value of the Holy Supper. An outright denial of this is but a poor argument, and to maintain in opposition, that the benefits of the sacrifice on the cross are most abundantly received through the mass,\* is in reality nothing more than to allow the propitiatory character, which has been asserted for the latter again to disappear in the sacramental, and confounds the distinction. Yet it serves nevertheless as a witness, as those also do who depart from the truth, but who must notwithstanding more or less do honor to it. Here also pertain all the more ancient† and more recent modifications, by which the attempt is made to subsume and subordi-

\* *Oblationis cruentæ fructus per incruentam, uberrimo percipiuntur, tantum abest, ut ille per hanc quovis modo derogetur.* Conc. Trident. Sess. XXII. c. 5.

† Compare Chemnitz Exan. Conc. Trident P. II. loc. 6, de missa art. 4.

nate the propitiatory value of the sacrifice of the mass to the sacrifice of Christ, by regarding it as an iterated representation (presentation,) or as a continuation,\* or as an antitypical commemorative offering,† or also as our presentation of that which Christ has offered for us on the cross. All this might be admitted in its proper place and in the sense of *faith* without trust in our own works, if the sacrifice on the cross would only always be recognized as the *one principal design of the sacrament of communion*, or as the gracious communication of the communion of Jesus, our mediator and propitiatory sacrifice, and that consequently the chief benefit to be derived from it is also to be adjudged to those only, who believingly receive it, and not to do or have it offered as meritorious work, either for ourselves or others, be they living or dead, which would be utterly useless.

According to this it is evident, that the Holy Supper is in its principal design not an expiatory sacrifice, through which man reconciles God to himself, but a sacrament or *sacramental feast* through which God forms a reconciliatory union with man and graciously imparts to him the righteousness and essential communion of Christ. From this it does, however, by no means follow, that the sacrament is altogether without sacrifice. This is a modern and one-sided view and differs decidedly from our Confession. All sacrifices in gen-

\*This is the view held by Möhler in his *Symbolic* § 34, (doctrine on the mass,) where he counts the Lord's "perpetual condescension to our infirmity in the eucharist, as part of that one mighty action undertaken out of love for us and expiatory of our sins."

†To this also amounts the view of the Irwingites, who connect the "sacramental offering" with the heavenly intercession which the Lord makes for us, but in so doing treat too slightly the sacramental communion; Comp. Rothe on the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ on the cross, and the sacrifice of the Church in the holy sacrament of the altar, Frankf. and Erlangen 2. Ed. 1854. The communion is regarded not as the end and object, but only as an appendix to the sacrificial service and only in a legal manner as a "performance of the command of the Lord, take and eat." p. 26. The critical examination of the reformatory doctrine is exceedingly poor and ignores entirely the decision of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession regarding sacrament and sacrifice, as well as Luther's opinion, who distinctly declares (W, vol. XIII. p. 704, in a sermon on Maundy-Thursaday,) that the Supper is in more respects than one also a *sacrifice*, an opinion with which Chemnitz and other respectable theologians of our church fully agree, without, however, conceding anything that might be prejudicial to the essence of the sacrament and the gospel, as is unfortunately the case on the part of the Irwingites, in whose liturgies the sacramental everywhere gives way to the sacrificial, and the evangelical to the legal.

eral have a sacramental (consecrating) aspect, so also have sacraments a sacrificial aspect; and as the Holy Supper is based on Christ's self-sacrifice, so also is its sacramental consecration and administration preceded by an offertory sacrifice of consecration and prayer, to be accompanied and followed by eucharistic offerings of praise and thanksgiving.\* Its celebration is introduced as an offertory by furnishing the table with the provision of bread and wine. To suffer this, however, to be done apart by the sexton without prayer, is not becoming.† The bringing forth of the bread and wine over which the solemnly wonderful blessing (*eulogia*) of the highest is to spread itself, the consecrating presentation of the temporal gifts (*προσφορά*) that the perfect gift from above may come upon them, the placing of these visible elements of the holy sacrament of the covenant upon the altar of incense (prayer before the All-holy, is an act far too full of meaning and too significant to be left to the mute door-keeper, or sexton of the church. Not that we for ourselves would exalt these trifling gifts, this humble meat and drink offering, or ascribe to it some merit or expiatory virtue, as is unfortunately done in the Romish mass, which pompously lifts up to God the simple bread before the *adoratorium* and before it is yet body and blood of Christ, as an *immaculate sacrifice for innumerable sins*, and the simple wine cup *for the salvation of the whole world*. Far be such an idle, empty conceit from us! It is rather our poverty, the small earthly element, the substance of our creature essence (the sighing creation,) which we poor sinners present in all humility and penitence, grateful to the Father for the merciful gifts of our daily bread and, at the same time, beseeching him in the name of the Son, that the heavenly bread of eternal life may unite itself to the temporal bread, so that it may become to us, through divine communication, the holy body of Christ, which is given for our redemption and constitutes the Church's everlasting food.‡

\*Compare Harnack's *der Christliche Gemeinde-Gottesdienst*, 254 ss. and 391 s.

†Luther (W. vol. X. p. 2757,) is in favor of having it done during the Patrem, i. e. during the repetition of the Creed.

‡Compare Kahn's, doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Leipzig, 1851, p. 31. The consecration, which in the Supper is pronounced over the elements, concerns the whole natural life, *the groaning creation* which as the ancient Church fathers so successfully maintained against the Gnostics, comes from the same God, who gave us Christ, as our Saviour.



After this presentation, and after the words of institution, which put us in mind that our hearts are to be lifted up, have been pronounced, the approach of the Lord is celebrated by singing the holy, holy, holy of the angels, who come with him, and the Advent anthem. Blessed be he that cometh, &c., &c. Hereupon let his holy testament be published in his presence and amid the surroundings of such a cloud of witnesses, and as he speaks, so it is done, and as he commands, so it stands fast. As under the old covenant it was not an unfrequent occurrence, that the glory of the Lord descended in the cloud of fire and spirit upon the sacrifice, glorifying it, thus it also glorifies itself here, whilst descending in blessing upon the gifts of bread and wine, and exalting them to the communion of the body and blood of Christ. Now is the Son of man ever again glorified in his Supper, and God is glorified in him, invisibly and mysteriously, it is true, yet really and evidently according to his word. O how glorious is the mystery,\* of this glorification of Jesus in the bread and wine of the New Testament through the condescension of his majesty! How sublime, how adorable appears the God-man in the humility of his love, in which he gives himself to his disciples under these insignificant earthly forms! Surely now must also ascend to him *eucharistic* praise and thanks-offering of faith and love; the *praise-offering of faith*, which in remembrance, both of the sacrificial sufferings as well as of the glorification of Christ at the right hand of the Father, where he makes intercession for us, extols his glory and lays hold of the benefits of his grace and trusts in God, in virtue of the power of his sacrifice; and the *thank-offering of love*, which returns the gift of the highest good it has received, by the penitent and believing surrender of the grateful heart and the will, and the consecration of the body which has been fed with the body of Christ, for sacrifice, which is living, holy and acceptable to God, Rom. 12: 1; 1 Peter 2: 5. Since now love is the bond of perfection, which unites God and man, and men and Christians among each other into the body of Christ, so also is doubtless continually taking place in the celebration of the communion a renewal of the new

\*The appellation *tremendum mysterium* given to it, refers to what Augustine so beautifully styles the horror *horroris et tremor amoris*, but not to that fear and trembling which was experienced at the foot of Mount Sinai and which according to Heb. 12: 18 ss. is banished from the Gospel.

covenant of grace and love, based upon the blood of Christ which evinces itself just as much on the side of God in the sacramental feast, as it does on the side of man in the sacrificial rendering of gifts and works of love, as well as in prayers and intercessions, in the name of Christ, for the Church, for all divine institutions and for all men, as prescribed by Paul with an express reference to Christ offered for us, 1 Tim. 3,\* Paul also refers 1 Cor. 10: 16 s., to such a celebration of the covenant, typified in Exod. 24, where he, after designating the bread which we break, as the communion of the body of Christ, says of the same bread, *for we being many are one bread and one body* (namely, the body of Christ, Rom. 12: 5), *for we are all partakers of that one bread*, and then cautions against all and every participation in heathen sacrificial feasts, because they place us in the same essential communion with the sacrificial subjects and objects of their altars, in which the Holy Supper places us with Christ, 1 Cor. 11: 18-21. Sacrifices of love in good works are especially recommended, (Heb. 10: 24: and 13: 15) in connection with the communion cultus, and in the same place, immediately preceding, is also specially mentioned the sacrifice of praise, or of confession, or of commemoration, which is equally required in the words of our Lord, *do this in remembrance of me*, and in the words of Paul. 1 Cor. 11: 26, *as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come*. To this points already prophetically the hymn connected with the Passover, Matt. 26: 30, the prophecy of Malachi 1: 11, concerning the universal meat and memorial offering to the name of the Lord† as well as the entire eucharistic cultus communicated to the seer of the Apocalypse, which the congregation above with which we are in communion (Heb. 12: 22-24), offers to the Lamb that was slain for us Rev. 4 and 5: Heb. 12: 22 ss. Hence also it is both right and proper to remember this assembly above in the liturgy of the Holy Supper‡

\*The custom, according to the ancient liturgies, of repeating the Lord's Prayer, together with "O Lamb of God," &c., serves as a precedent.

†The meat offerings were also memorial offerings, See Lev. 2: 2, 9, 16.

‡Chemnitz (Exam. Conc. Trid. p. II. loc. 6 *de missa pontificia* sect. 3) designates it as *verba pulcherrima in Canone: Nobis quoque*

## (d) Concerning the cup.

Thus then the fellowship of Christians in worship and prayer, or their celebration of the communion, which is at once sacramental and sacrificial, centres in the presence of the Lord at his table; it concentrates itself around the consecrated bread which is the communion of the body of Christ which was given for us, around the bread which we break, i. e. communicate or distribute\* (Acts 2 : 42-46 s.) as the pledge and bond of essential communion with him and through him with one another.

But it concentrates itself no less around the *consecrated cup*, of which we have thus far already incidentally spoken in connection with the bread, but which we must now more especially consider, because the words of the institution also say some things especially concerning it. These correspond nearer with those used by Matt. 26 : 27 s. and Mark 14 : 23 s. in reference to the bread, inasmuch as according to both, it is said of the cup or its contents, *this is my blood*, to which in both is added, *of the New Testament, which is shed for many*, and by Matthew in particular, *for the remission of sins*. In Luke 22 : 20 and Paul, 1 Cor. 11 : 25 it is said of the cup itself, *this cup is the New Testament in my blood, &c.* In all the four texts of the testamentary words of institution in regard to the cup, the *zaccē deazxē* is prominently mentioned as consummated in the shedding and appropriation of the blood of Christ. The peculiar character of this New Testament or covenant may be best inferred from 2 Cor. 3 : 6 ss. and Heb. 9 : 11 ss. where a comparison between both Testaments is instituted, and where in the latter passage special mention is also made of the blood of the Old (Exod. 24 : 8) and new covenant. The old covenant is that

*peccatoribus, famulis tuis, de multitudine miserationum tuarum sperantibus, partem aliquam et societatem dare digneris cum sanctis tuis, inter quorum nos consortium non æstimator meriti, sed veniæ quaesumus largitor admittē, per Christum dominum nostrum.* On the other hand he characterizes the invocation of, and the appeal to, the merits of the saints as *abominatio*.

\*As regards the breaking of bread I can only conform to the mode of Dr. Harnack in his "Christlicher Gemeindegottesdienst im apostolischen und altkatholischen Zeitalter, Erlangen 1854, p. 173 ss., who in conformity with the older Lutheran Theologians refers to it first and foremost to the *distribution* which is very important in the communion, without, however, ascribing to it any essential and sacrificial significance. I also appeal to the deductions of that learned man, given before and after that passage, in reference to the Holy Supper in the Apostolic age, in confirmation of my own.

of the *law* which imparts a knowledge of sin, requires the righteousness of works, preaches condemnation to the guilty and effects by the blood of its imperfect and typical sacrifices only an imperfect and never sufficient atonement, and must, consequently, be continually repeated. The new covenant, on the contrary, is that of the *Gospel*, which proclaims grace, satisfies the law on our behalf with the righteousness of Christ, promises in his holy name the entire forgiveness of sin or justification and, through the perfect sacrifice of his blood shed but once upon the cross, makes a complete atonement for all our debt of sin. That Jesus Christ, the only mediator between God and man and the high-priest of the New Testament, has finished his work and sacrifice fully in the sight of God, is the doctrine distinctly set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews. All that yet remains is, that this covenant of grace be carried into effect in us *men*, by having the instrument of union, which is the atoning and sanctifying blood of Christ, appropriated to us, our whole being touched by it, our hearts sprinkled with it (Heb. 10 : 22 ; 12 : 24), and thus the whole man made partaker with the essence of his Mediator in reconciliation and united with him in that righteousness which is acceptable to God, and which gives life and salvation. This is effected in the covenantal celebration of the holy communion, within the Zion of the New Testament, analagous to the covenantal celebration of the Old Testament at Mount Sinai, Exod. 24 : 8. Here the blood of the sacrifice was no longer offered to God sacrificially, but rather applied to the congregation sacramentally, for Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, behold this is the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you (comp. Heb. 9 : 19, 20), whereupon here also a holy feast followed (Exod. 24 : 11). In the Holy Supper such an external sprinkling with "scarlet wool and hyssop" does not take place, but the lips of the communicant are moistened, (Isaiah 6 : 7), by means of the cup, with the blood of the New Testament, and with it *his own* blood and heart are internally affected by it, an occurrence, which is so much the less to be regarded as incredible, because the drinking of simple wine produces not only physical, but also psychical effects, in as much as it maketh glad the heart of man, Ps. 104 : 15. What a blessing, what grace for all who are called to the assembly and Church of the first-born, (Heb. 12 : 22-24) : thus to be sprinkled and refreshed with the glorified blood of Christ, with the



blood of the New Testament of reconciliation, and in this way to become so heartily assured of perfect pardon and reconciliation and so firmly and confidently fixed in the peace of God and the Lamb, by whose wounds we are healed ! Hence the emphasis laid upon the words, *for the forgiveness of sin*, by Matthew when he speaks of the cup. Surely it is a glorious privilege and sacred duty of the ministry of the New Testament to whom is committed the word of reconciliation, so also to confirm and establish it by the presentation of the cup with the blood of the new covenant ; and certainly with this duty corresponds the inalienable right of every member of the covenant people to this covenant cup which as such is itself according to Luke and Paul the *new covenant in the blood of Christ*. How sacred and full of salvation, therefore, is this cup and how worthily glorifies itself in it also the gracious presence of the Lord, whose life-blood is a life-giving drink indeed, John 6 : 53-56. To withhold it from the laity, for whom the Lord has designed it, or, having designed it for *all* (Matt. 26 : 27) to withhold it from individual souls, can be regarded in no other light than that of a gross wrong, and no other apology is to be offered in extenuation of it, except that which our Saviour offered in extenuation of the crimes committed by those who crucified him, namely, they know not what they do.

Yet it is nevertheless an act of the highest presumption to declare the cup, which the Lord in his testament has so solemnly and in language so distinctly referring to it instituted for all, as superfluous, and withhold it at the communion from communicants. Even though the two elements in the sacrament were as similar as are the two eyes in a man's face, it would be equally as unjust to set one of them aside, as to remove one of these eyes, because he sees with both the same things. Hence the assumption of the concomitancy, according to which the whole Christ is present in both forms, namely, the blood equally in the body, and the body equally in the blood, and that, consequently, the same gift would be doubly received, can not at all justify the mutilation of the sacrament and the withholding of it from the communicants for whom the two-fold gift of God is reduced to *one*. But it can not on any account, be conceded, that the two forms of the sacrament which are externally so very different, should internally be so entirely the same, that the withdrawal of the second would not involve the loss of anything essential to the Christian. It is true that the whole Christ is person



ally present at his table, as has been sufficiently shown above, and does not communicate himself in two presences, the one of his body and the other of his blood, which are not to be considered as abstract essences. Yet it must also be allowed in deference to the word and meaning of the Lord, that the one essential presence of the God-man exercises a diverse influence on the two diverse elements of his sacrament. The mysteries of the most holy love, with which we have to deal here in humble devotion, are exceedingly delicate; but not so darkly mysterious as to prevent us from distinguishing anything in them, although the word of the Lord distinguishes both forms (*species*) of his communication specifically and mentions previously in addition to the meat also the drink of eternal life. John 6: 53. Hence he does by no means permit us to make both resemble each other so closely (as for instance one breast of a mother resembles another) that it would be altogether a matter of indifference whether we received only one and dispensed entirely with the other. But in what the different influences consist which the present Christ exerts upon the bread, which is the communion of his body, and upon the wine, which is the communion of his blood, this we cannot discern with our senses, but only guess at it by supposing, that the influence upon the bread which is more of a substantial nature, is nourishing, and that upon the wine which is more of an essential nature, is invigorating, or that the first exerts more of a somatically binding and uniting and the latter more of a psychically refreshing and purifying influence upon the participants, the one satisfying more the hungering, and the other more the thirsting of the soul (Matt. 5: 6,) after God and his peace in Christ, who is himself our peace. Eph. 2: 14. The living blood is according to the view of the holy Scriptures the internal higher vital power of the body, the current of life within it, the seat of motion or support of the animating soul (*πνεῦμα, anima*). In as much as the life and soul of the body is in the blood, Lev. 17: 11,) the *expiatory* virtue of the sacrifice is consequently also less ascribed to the death of the body, than to the shedding of the blood and to its application by sprinkling. Heb. 9: 22. This is especially the case in v. 12 ss. of the same chapter and in other passages of the New Testament, where the blood of Christ is chiefly spoken of as possessing the propitiatory, redeeming and purifying efficacy, for which reason it is also denominated in the testamentary words of the Lord *the blood of the New Testament* or *cove-*

nant which is shed for *the remission of sin*, whilst the consecrated cup itself is called the new covenant in his blood, because it binds and concludes the covenant in the blood of Christ to the communicants.\* Hence it must assuredly also have its special signification and peculiar higher value as a most cogent *pledge* and vivifying *bond of love* of a perfect reconciliation with God in Christ, and must on no account be treated as inferior to the bread, or be altogether dispensed with at the communion, as is presumptuously done by the Romish church.† Though it be but a man's testament, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto, Gal. 3: 15, and the testament of the Lord, after it has become of force through his death, Heb. 9: 17, should not be permitted to be abridged and mutilated by those to whom he has committed its execution and by them delivered to his heirs in this mangled condition. Never has the church, which is to be subject to Christ as the faithful wife is subject to her husband, (Eph. 5: 24,) received such a permission, and dare not, therefore, stunt or abridge, in violation of the testament, the heritage of the children, under any pretext whatever. The evangelic orthodox church holds with unshaken firmness to the whole of the sacred testament of her Lord and heavenly high-priest, who has faithfully promised and secured to her his real mediatorial presence, and its manifestation and gracious communication in the Holy Supper. She recognizes in it with fervent praise and devout gratitude a deep condescending and softly veiled appearance of his glory on earth in organic connection with the entire manifestation and glorification of God in the flesh, a shekinah full of grace and truth, John 1: 14.

(c) Concerning Christ's sayings uttered in connection with the institution of the Holy Supper.

\*It takes in a certain sense the place of the blood-sprinkled on the Kapporeth of the ark of the covenant of the O. T. That, moreover the cup of the N. T. in the blood of Christ cannot merely be filled with wine, which only signifies, but is not wine, is incontrovertibly evident, for in that case it would not be what it is, but only a shadow of it.

†If in Acts 2: 42, &c., the Lord's Supper is designated simply by the mention of the *breaking of bread*, it as little excludes the cup at the communion, as eating in general excludes drinking. In the same way does, according to 1 John 5: 6, the coming of Christ with his *blood* not exclude his coming with his *body*. The body and blood of Christ nourish and increase, as living pledges of love, not only justifying *faith*, but also sanctifying love and the blessed hope of a future glorification. For where there is forgiveness of sin, there also are life and salvation, and conversely.

The entire gospel, as well as the 1 Epistle of John, is permeated with the manifestation of the divine glory in the essence of the Son of Man; but more especially is this the case with the discourses and sacerdotal prayer of Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed. From the moment when he, who had just washed his disciples' feet, declared, Now is the Son of man glorified and God is glorified in him, from that moment are shining forth from the betrayed the rays of Divine greatness as sublime as they are mild. How sublime and, at the same time, how full of tenderness is his conversation with his disciples, as recorded to the end of chapter 14. A fearful prospect is awaiting him and them; yet he, attesting his divinity, speaks comfortably to them: *Let not your heart be troubled, if ye believe in God, ye also believe in me; and further on, I go to prepare a place for you. I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.* These words about his going away and coming again, so full of promise and uttered immediately after he had established, in the institution of the Holy Supper, a memorial of his name, in order in it to come to us and bless us, (Exod. 20: 24,) and to take us to himself into the communion of his essence, give to us a new and weighty testimony of his essential presence as in heaven so on earth, in his church and his sacrament. And the succeeding declaration, I am the way, the truth and the life, the true and living way, (Heb. 10: 20,) proves again that his way-preparing, i. e. mediatorial presence is like Jacob's ladder, reaching from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth and, here especially, where Bethel stands on consecrated ground. Gen. 28: 17-19. After this comes Philip's request: *Lord show us the Father, and it sufficeth us,* which is followed by the gracious and sublime answer: *Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.* O! truly a blessed recognition and beholding of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ, (2 Cor. 4: 6,) was permitted to the disciple. We cannot think of it without feeling that awe of reverence and tremor of love, (horror honoris et tremor amoris) which is also experienced by believing communicants at the holy communion. The succeeding encouragements to prayer in his name, together with the promise that it shall be answered, that the Father may be honored in the Son, as well as the promise of his coming with the Father and the sending of the Holy Ghost and the giving of his peace, all give evidence how

infinitely the Son of man is glorified in God and God in him, and with what profound truth he can and does realize the word of his more than maternal compassion surely and especially in the sacrament, *I will not leave you orphans, I will come to you.* He it is, who comes by water and blood, Jesus Christ, and with him comes the Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son and beareth witness. 1 John 5: 6.

According to the first three Evangelists the Lord connects with his Supper this farewell of his visible communion at the table with his disciples. *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.* Then, after the meal had been concluded, (John 14: 21,) follow, in intimate connection, the words of the Lord concerning himself as the true vine, John 15: 1ss. affording very striking evidence, how the discontinuance of his visible communion did not only not abolish the essential union with him, but how it must, in actual organical connection, like that between the vine and its branches, always endure and establish itself continually anew in a reciprocal covenant of love. When Christ calls himself the true (consequently not merely figurative) vine and his Father the husbandman, who raises the branches on him, it is beyond all doubt, that the Son does not indicate himself as the vine according to his purely human nature, according to which we are not his branches, but according to his divine-human essence, according to which we are one substance with him. The vine, which sustains us as branches, can certainly not be transplanted into heaven merely to grow only there, but must also flourish on earth and nourish us with the sap and vigor of its essence, because we, if separated from it, would soon wither and grow cold in love and die. John 15: 6. As he loves us, and, therefore, also abides in us, so also are we again to love him and one another, and abide in him and permit nothing to separate us from his love and presence. Such a union, continually nurtured and renewed through the holy communion, gives consolation, strength and fortitude in all afflictions, temptations and persecutions for the sake of the beloved, who also on that account predicts to his disciples after the Supper a participation in his sufferings, John 15: 18ss. But he promises to his disciples not only a participation in his sufferings, but also in his joys and glorification. (John 16) and gives to them finally

the assurance of his peace, which is based upon the glory of his victory over the world and its sorrow. John 16 : 33.

After all this follows the crowning consecratory act of that night of the first celebration of the Supper and the glorification of the Lord, that sacerdotal and most holy prayer, John 17, which is sustained by the consciousness of the primal glory of the Son with the Father, which he now prays to have also so gloriously glorified in his human nature, that his disciples may also participate in it, and be eternally united with the Father through him, the Mediator and high-priest of reconciliation, and of the glorification of God and men. The glory which thou gavest me I have given them, he says in verse 22 ss. that they may be one, even as we are one : I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in me ; and that the world may know, that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Worthy of thanks and adoration appear, in this sublime conversation of the Son with the Father, both the divine majesty and the compassionate love of the Son of man, with which he communicates his glory to those who believe in him, and in whom he dwells as in the temple of his body, in which the holy communion is celebrated with him to the end of the world. Who is worthy, who is able to praise his glory as it deserves and sufficiently to magnify him, the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, the good Shepherd and the holy Lamb, the bread of eternal life, our Saviour Jesus !

*Lauda Sion Salvatorem,  
Lauda ducem et pastorem  
Cum hymnis et canticis.  
Quantum potes, tantum aude  
Quia major omni laude,  
Nec laudare sufficis.*

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF FASTING.

By Rev. M. Valentine, A. M., Reading, Pa.

Captious Scribes and Pharisees come to Christ with the inquiry, Why His disciples are not found *Fasting*, like



themselves and the disciples of John. The reply is a beautiful explanation of their non-observance of any such service at that time, and an explicit statement of a fact that should appear in all future ages of the Christian Church: "Can ye make the children of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days." Luke 5: 34-35. "Those days" soon came to the Church, they continue yet, and will, till Christ shall come again. If, as amid marriage festivities, His disciples were excused from fasting, whilst enjoying his personal presence, are we not to expect it now that He has "gone away?" Has not the Redeemer announced fasting as a characteristic of his followers? The object of this article is, to recall the Scripture doctrine in regard to this part of Christian service.

I. *Fasting is a Christian Service.* It is recognized as a part of the believer's proper practice. It belongs to the Christian life, endorsed in the Scriptures as an acceptable and profitable service. From some cause or other, there is but little practical acknowledgment of this truth, in a large portion of the Church of the present day. Fasting has fallen into general disesteem and disuse. With some it has become the custom to deny it any place among proper and scriptural services. They speak of it as a thing, belonging only to a former and superseded dispensation. They class its observance among the superstitions, which the progress of the present day has not yet fully thrown off. A sad illustration of this may be seen in the rationalistic article on "Fasts" in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. The author of the article, Dr. J. R. Beard, speaks of it as having had "its origin in false and heathen conceptions," as being rather endured than approved by Moses, among the chosen people, and as being entirely disapproved by Christ in the Christian Church. It is held up as a superstition, unworthy of any place in the Christian's regard or practice. The rationalism of those who profess the "liberal Christianity" of our times, is largely imbued with this sentiment. With some others, who do not go so far as to discard it as a relic of ignorance and superstitious misconception, there is, however, a strong prejudice against fasting, from its perversion and abuse in the Romish Church and elsewhere. The bald formality and hypocrisy of the service, in many cases, have produced a feeling of aversion to the whole thing. Fasting

to discriminate between true fasting, and the corruptions *men* have introduced into it, and the abuses they have associated with it, many depreciate the entire external act, and attempt to *spiritualize* all allusions which the Scriptures make to it as a Christian duty. And even where its propriety is admitted, it is often assigned but little importance, and its practice either never or seldom appears among the exercises of their piety. It is true, indeed, that the theoretical and expository discussions of nearly all of our most eminent theologians give fasting some place among Christian services; yet in the practical piety of the Church, it is, beyond disguise, but little esteemed and less observed. Few features of Bible piety are less alluded to in the pulpit: no service, perhaps, is more neglected. Looking at the prevalent sentiment and practice of the Church, and making a comparison of them with the prominence given to fasting in the Holy Scriptures, we can hardly resist the conviction that there has been some departure from the truth, as once held by the saints. But that this service is not to be placed among the superseded observances of a past dispensation, nor among the asceticisms of a rude age, nor among the indifferent and useless things of theological doctrine, worthy of general neglect, is plainly apparent in the light of the divine teaching.

1. For proof, we turn first to the Old Testament. The Jewish Church was not a different Church from the Christian, but the same under a preparatory dispensation and earlier development. It embodied the truth of God, and represented the piety, acceptable to Him. It is impossible to overlook the prominence of fasting in the divinely sanctioned religion of that dispensation. It was woven into the common practice of the pious.

Nothing is said of fasting among the Patriarchs. Yet it is probable that they observed it, as may be judged from the fact that when first instituted, among the required acts of piety, Lev. 16 : 29 ; 23 : 27-29, it appears to be mentioned as no new institution, but as an old and well-known practice. But beginning with Moses we have constant records of it. When he entered the Mount, to receive the Law, and commune with God, he abstained from food, forty days. This must have been by divine direction and miraculous aid. There was but one *stated, regularly recurring* Fast, ordained in the Jewish Church. This was on the great day of annual atonement, when the sins of the people were brought special-

ly to mind. This observance was so prominent, that the occasion obtained the simple designation of "The Fast," Acts 27 : 9. It was surely by divine authority, that fasting was made a part of the high solemnities of the day of atonement. Special public fasts were frequently appointed and observed. Joshua and the Elders of Israel when defeated by the men of Ai, kept a fast, and remained prostrate before the ark from morning to evening. Josh. 7 : 6. When unsuccessful, on several occasions, in the war against Benjamin, "*The children of Israel*, and all the people, went up and came unto the House of God, and wept, and *fasted* that day until even, and offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before the Lord," Judges 20 : 26. The Israelites, pressed by the Philistines, assembled in penitence "before the Lord at Mizpeh, and fasted that day there, and said, We have sinned against the Lord." 1 Sam. 7 : 6. Assailed by the confederate forces of Ammon and Moab, Jehoshaphat appointed a day of fasting and prayer throughout the kingdom. 2 Chron. 20 : 3. While yet in Babylon, Nehemiah set apart a season of special prayer, accompanied with fasting, on account of the desolations of the city and people of God ; and afterward, when he came to Jerusalem, he proclaimed a public and solemn fast, to deplore the low state of religion, and to pray for pardoning and restoring mercy. Neh. 1 : 4 ; 9 : 1. When, from the conspiracy of Haman, perils closed around Queen Esther and her people, she set apart three days, as a season of solemn prayer and abstinence from food, and all the Jews in Shushan united in the fast. Esther 4 : 16. When Ezra was about to set out on his important mission to Jerusalem, he assembled the returning captives at the river Ahava, and there "proclaimed a fast, that they might afflict themselves before God, and seek of Him a right way for themselves, and their little ones, and for all their substance," Ezra 8 : 21. In a day of great political and moral desolation, God's direction to Judah by the mouth of His prophet, was, "Sanctify a fast ; call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land unto the house of the Lord, your God, and cry unto the Lord," Joel 1 : 14. "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly ; gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, \* \* let the bridegroom go forth out of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O

Lord, and give not thy heritage to reproach," Joel 2: 15-17. Even the heathen inhabitants of Nineveh, in view of threatened judgments, proclaimed a season of humiliation and prayer, in which all, from the oldest to the youngest, were required to abstain from food," Jonah 3: 5. Now it must be remembered that God sanctioned these services of public fasting, by His manifest blessing. This is a fact of much significance. The armies of Joshua became thenceforward victorious. The children of Israel were no longer smitten before Benjamin. They discomfited the Philistines at Mizpeh. The leagued strength of Ammon and Moab was broken by Jehoshaphat. To Nehemiah was given the privilege of seeing the desolations of the city and people of God disappear before the fervor and activity of a revived piety. Esther and her people experienced a most signal deliverance. Ezra realized the blessing which he sought with such humble importunity. The flood-tide of judgment was rolled back from even the guilty inhabitants of Nineveh. And on compliance with the prophet's call, there was waiting the promise of abundant blessings.

In addition to these facts which were, now and then, observed, as prompted by casual occurrences, there were several general public fasts which the people were accustomed to celebrate, at fixed times, every successive year. One was kept on the ninth day of the fifth month, in mournful commemoration of the burning of the holy city by Nebuzaradan, 2 Kings 25: 8-11; Jer. 52: 12; Zech. 7: 3-5; 8: 19. Another was observed in the seventh month, as an expression of sorrow for the murder of Gedaliah at Mizpeh, Jer. 41: 1-2. And a third was held on the tenth day of the tenth month, to commemorate the commencement of the dread siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, 2 Kings 25: 1; Zech. 8: 19.

But there was also private fasting. It was the frequent personal practice of devout and eminent leaders of the Jewish church. Of their own accord, whenever their feelings and judgment so prompted, they resorted to it, in connection with prayer, as a holy, acceptable and profitable service. Of this service by Moses, when he ascended Sinai to receive from God the institutes of religion, and returned with the splendor of an angel radiating from his face, we have already been reminded. The wonderful Elijah, approved of God by the marvel of translation, fasted, like Moses, on one occasion,



forty days and forty nights. David fasted, as well as prayed, during the illness of his child. Assailed by his enemies, he says, in one of his Psalms, "I humbled my soul with fasting and prayer," 35: 13. And in affliction, he declares, "I wept and chastened my soul with fasting," Ps. 69: 10. Daniel, oppressed with a view of the desolations of Zion, set his face to seek God "by prayer and supplications with fasting," Dan. 9: 3, and about to receive a special communication relative to the destiny of the Church, he spent three weeks in partial fasting, denying himself luxurious living and accompanying his fervent devotions with abstinence from all pleasant food, 10: 2-3. And what do these examples disclose? Certainly, that fasting, as an auxiliary to prayer and humiliation, occupied a high place in the esteem and practice of the approved saints of God, of old. Multiplied incidental expressions abound in the Old Testament which show that it was common. And though God sometimes rebuked the abuse and perversion of the external practice, just as he reproved the perversion of *many* of his most sacred ordinances. He yet manifested abundant favor toward it, whenever performed in the true spirit of devotion and obedience. This is incontrovertible. So undeniable, indeed, is it, that even Dr. Cumming, whose prejudices lead him to discountenance all literal and actual fasting as a religious service, is compelled to make the admission, "Though it is not a divine prescription, it is yet unquestionable, that in almost every instance of fervent piety, and especially of public prayer, fasting was observed. *Vide* Lect. on Dan. p. 286. The truth, as thus far made clear, is that fasting was a service appointed, and approved of God, in the Old Testament dispensation. The light of this fact illumines the path of further examination.

2. And now we turn to the New Testament. This is final law for us as Christians. Does it disapprove of fasting, or whisper the first intimation that it is to pass away, and have no place in Christian life?

Opening the Gospel, one of its first scenes, in which the Holy Jesus appears as the center, is portrayed with a high and beautiful commendation of the piety of Anna, the prophetess, who "served God day and night with *fastings and prayers*" in the temple. Luke 2: 36, 37. Next we behold *Jesus Christ himself*, forever the great exemplar for His people, entering on his public ministry after a long season of fasting in the wilderness. That fast, though miraculous, ac-



knowledge and held forth the general principle involved. His fasting was not Jewish or ceremonial; for it obeyed no law of Moses. It was in the highest degree a spiritual service. In confronting the powers of temptation, he nerved his soul by retiring from the carnal and material into the spiritual, and withdrawing from feeding on "bread alone" to the exclusive use of the words which proceed out of the mouth of God. As the infallible Teacher, in his sermon on the mount, Christ has given a high endorsement of fasting, associating it with alms-giving and prayer. The Pharisees had corrupted and perverted all three of these services. Our Lord corrects the abuses in all, and treats all in the same way. He rescues all alike from the uses of hypocrisy. Speaking to his disciples, He had just said, "But *thou* when *thou* doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth"; "But *thou* when *thou* prayest, enter into thy closet." He does not command or forbid prayer or alms-giving, but takes for granted that Christians will do both. Just so with fasting: "When ye fast, be not as the hypocrites;"—"But *thou*, when *thou* fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face, that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which seeth in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." This *assumes* that Christians will fast, and prescribes the way and spirit of the service, to be acceptable. He directs *how* his disciples are to engage in the service, so as to secure a *reward from the Father*. Surely this cannot be claimed as a discouragement to fasting. If His correction of abuses, has not prohibited prayer and alms in the Christian church, it certainly cannot be regarded as disapproving of fasting. On the contrary, if His language is to be understood as endorsing the former, it must be held as likewise endorsing the latter. It is an implication so clear, as to amount almost to the force of a positive institute, that fasting is to be held as a permanent feature of the piety of the New Testament, as it had been of that of the Old. In harmony with this, is the declaration made by Christ, in connection with his explanation of the reason why his disciples did not fast whilst he was with them: "The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days." Christ opposes this statement, as a *fact*, to the cavils of the Jews. Though his disciples fast not while He is present to their senses, when he is removed they will urge their way, by fasting, into closer spiritual communion with Him.

Exalting this exercise still higher, He announces that the greatest power with God is possible only through it: "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." Matt. 17: 21.

Looking now to the time referred to in the words, "When the bridegroom shall be taken away," we have a commentary on His words. Christian's did fast. Among the apostles and primitive disciples, we see the full and active continuance of this exercise in the Church. The reader of the Acts of the Apostles is struck by the frequency with which fasting is represented as the accompaniment of prayer. And the records of its observance associate it with the highest and most solemn aspects of Christian service. When Barnabas and Saul were to be separated to a special and important mission, "They *fasted* and *prayed* and laid their hands on them." Acts 13: 3. On another occasion, "When they had ordained them elders in every Church, and had prayed with *fasting*, they commended them to the Lord," Acts 14: 23. Is not our usual feasting in connection with ordination services variant from the spirit of apostolic practice? It was whilst the prophets and teachers in the Church at Antioch were "ministering to the Lord and *fasting*," that they received a message from the Holy Spirit. Acts 13: 1, 2. Cornelius, the Centurion, is mentioned with approval as a "devout man, and one that feared God. He testifies, "Four days ago, I was fasting until this hour." Peter fasted in connection with his praying on the house-top at Joppa, Acts 10: 9, 10, 30. Paul claims that he "approved himself" in "fastings," as well as in "labors," and "watchings," and "by pureness and knowledge," 2 Cor. 6: 4-6. And in 1 Cor. 7: 5, he calls to "*fasting* and prayer," in a manner that shows that he looked upon it as a permanent service of piety in the Christian Church.

Such is the teaching of the New Testament. Such was the practice of the apostolic Church, and primitive Christians. Surely it does not look as if there ought to be no fasting among the followers of Christ. Scripture points in the other direction. And so does the examples of those, who say to us, by divine inspiration, "Be ye followers of us."

This practice continued in the early Church. "The custom obtained, that most Christians occasionally and privately joined abstinence from their food with their prayers."

Mocheim, Eccl. Hist. Vol. I. p. 87. Neander states, that they were accustomed to fast either partially, or entirely; whilst devoting many separate days to self-examination and prayer, and dedicating their life anew to God. And he traces how, from the primitive freedom and spirituality of the service, there was a gradual departure which resulted in the obligatory, stated, and formal fasts of the Romish Church. Hist. of Chr. Rel. Vol. I. 293-300. The historical relations of scriptural fasting, are briefly given by Dr. E. N. Kirk, of Boston: "I believe all the Church's eminent men, of every communion, have been distinguished for this exercise. I do not remember any of any age, who considered it as obsolete or useless. Down to the time of the Reformation, no true Christian any more thought of neglecting fasting than prayer. After the Reformation, we find two classes: those who chose to confound the Romish abuse with the institution itself; and those who practiced it in primitive simplicity. And I repeat my impression, that the men, most eminent for piety, in every branch of the Protestant Church, used this means of grace."

The position of our Church is in entire harmony with this exhibition of Scripture doctrine. Art. XXVI. of the Augsburg Confession, where the subject is introduced in connection with "Diversity of Meats," endorses true fasting, while it condemns its perversion and abuse. The Confessors reject as unscriptural, and at variance with Christian freedom, the appointment of *stat. I ecclesiastical* fasts, whose observance is made *obligatory* on the consciences of men. They especially condemn the Romish teaching, "that grace must be merited by the observance of laws, by fasts, and by diversities of meats." They, however, teach that, "*Every Christian ought to restrain himself by bodily discipline as fasting and other exercise, in order to avoid giving any occasion to sin, but not to merit grace or make satisfaction for sins, by these works.*" "*Thus fasting is not rejected, but the making of a necessary service out of it, upon fixed days, and with particular meats, to the confusion of the consciences of men.*" Luther's Smaller Catechism gives an explicit approval in referring to the qualifications for a worthy reception of the Lord's Supper: "*Fasting and bodily preparation are indeed a good external discipline.*" Our Church has, therefore, accepted it as a truth, that fasting is sanctioned under the New Testament dispensation, and com-

mends its practice, when understood in its true intent, as promotive of the piety of believers. Following the example of her Lord, in His Sermon on the Mount, she vindicates it from abuse, and says to Christians, "When *ye* fast," do it not under the constraint of human regulations, or with any idea of meriting grace.\*

II. *Its Nature. What is Fasting as a religious service.*

1. We will fail to obtain a true conception of it, unless we recognize its intensely spiritual nature. Far removed from mere formality, it is an act of a truly earnest and deeply exercised soul. It has, however, an external part. There must be actual abstinence from food, either partially or entirely, during the season of fasting. This is unquestionably the Scripture pattern. The best internal devotional frame alone, is not fasting. We search in vain for any thing in the Bible, that looks like the notion that we can fulfil the duty in question, merely "in spirit." Some have spoken of the service as fulfilled in humble and careful abstinence from sin. But abstinence from sin, is a constant duty, whether we eat or drink or whatever we do. It is palpable wresting of all the precepts and examples of the Word of God on the subject to claim that in fasting, we can drop the actual abstinence, and yet fulfil the thing. We cannot do it, any more than we can partake of the Lord's Supper only in spirit, or "give alms" only in spirit. But while abstinence from food is an essential part of Scriptural fasting, the degree of that abstinence must be left to the judgment and conscience of each individual. It may be total, for a time, from all food, and drink; or it may be a partial abstinence, like Daniel's, in which the pleasure of the table are refused. But, more or less rigid, as each believer shall find it best, the abstinence is but a means to a spiritual end. It is not a mere externalism. As true prayer involves more than the act of kneeling, or repeating a form of words, so it is in fasting. Simple abstinence from food is not a religious service—only a medical regimen. If the heart is all the while going out after the world, and the physical fasting is not made the attendant and help of inward exercises of soul; if sin is still cherished and wickedness indulged, it is all a vain mockery, or hypo-

\*The Westminster Confession of the Presbyterian Church, also commends fasting, among other acts of devotion: "Religious oaths, and vows, solemn fastings, and thanksgivings upon special occasions; which are, in their several times and seasons, to be used in an holy and religious manner." Chap. 21, Sec. 5.

critical pretence, before God, just as when one takes the form of prayer, yet does not pray. We might thus multiply fast days, and observe them with Popish or even Mohamadan exactitude and rigor, and yet do nothing acceptable or profitable. It would be but a solemn pretence. A holy God who looks on the heart as well as on the outward appearance, might, and doubtless would, still say to us, as he did to his professing people of old, who practiced the form without the reality, *Is it such a fast that I have chosen?* Is. 58: 5. Observe, that it is implied even here that there is a fast which God has "chosen;" but it is not "*such*" a one, destitute of the true spirit—a formal afflicting of the soul and bowing of the head like a bulrush, without the spiritual services, in heart and act of judgment, justice and mercy. Such a pretence is an abomination to God. The primary thing, then, is the internal disposition. It is useless if only the body, and not the soul, fasts. It involves true and hearty repentance of sin. It associates itself with godly humiliation, where is found the contrite heart into which God enters as His second heaven. And it implies reformation, in which the spiritual exercise results in a life, meet for repentance.

2. It is evident that this separates all true fasting from the abuses and perversions which have brought it into discredit. It cannot be viewed as a *meritorious service*. It is at this point that the Romish Church has perverted the truth. Its teaching is a delusion, making its own members dupes and other men, mockers and seepies. It has turned the truth of God into a lie. If fasting be looked upon as meritorious, it would better not be observed. Then it only deludes and destroys. This was the fatal mistake of the Pharisee who went up to the temple to pray, saying, "I fast twice a week." He depended upon it and boasted in it, as a deserving work. Thousands still look on it as meritorious penance, or self-inflicted suffering atoning for sin and earning divine favor. They put it in the place of the Saviour. This is the great error on the subject, against which the condemnation of the Augsburg Confession is leveled. The Reformers were specially careful to uproot the whole Romish doctrine of human merit, as dishonoring Christ and misleading souls. In accordance with the Scriptures, they held up Christ, as the only ground of the sinner's hope. They pointed the eye of faith only to the Redeemer's cross. Rome was teaching the people to *merit* God's grace by penances



and fasting. Against this destructive error, the Confessors opposed the truth: "It is diametrically contrary to the Gospel, either to institute or perform such works with a view to *merit* pardon of sin," Aug. Conf. Art. XXVI. The true doctrine rescues fasting from that abuse. Men have perverted prayer, as well as fasting. They have repeated Pater-nosters, and Ave Marias by the hundred, as meritorious works.

The true doctrine exhibits a merely *formal* observance as equally a perversion of the conception of fasting. Much of its practice that we see is an empty form—the outward abstinence without the inward spirit. This has resulted from a departure from the Scriptural teaching and practice on the subject. It is plain, that throughout the Bible it is held up as an entirely voluntary, or spontaneous service, prompted by the occasion, and the heart of the worshipper. It is evident that neither Christ nor his apostles appointed any permanent and regularly recurring fast-days, or seasons, in the Christian Church. There is not a hint of any such thing. When, how often, and how long, he will fast, is left to each Christian's heart. It is to be emphatically a thing of the heart. It is to be altogether a free-will service. Arbitrarily to fix days and seasons, and leave other time clear of it, is not the Scriptural theory of fasting. It is entirely a human arrangement, and inevitably runs into formality and abuse. When the times and seasons and modes of the service are prescribed by ecclesiastical rule or law, its external part is observed as a matter of course, but not being prompted by the heart, it becomes mostly a heartless thing. This again has been the error of the Romish Church, and to a large extent of the Episcopal Church of both Great Britain and the United States. Friday abstinence and Lent season, are arbitrary arrangements, unknown to the word of God; and their compulsory observance, with general heartlessness has done more than anything else to bring fasting, as a religious act, into disrepute. The external act is generally given as the discharge of the whole duty. But here, too, our Church has taken the Bible position. It has vindicated the principle of true Christian liberty, and released believers from the burden of rigid ecclesiastical ritualism. We have no regular ecclesiastical fasts. The Confession utterly condemns the system. "*We do not object to fasting itself, but to the fact that it is represented as a necessary duty, and that specific days have been fixed for its performance.*" Aug

Conf. Art. XXVI. Formality is the inevitable consequence of a system of stated fast-days. It is a departure from the Scriptural arrangement. If we give to anything, intended by God as a free-will service, an arbitrary and artificial fixedness, we almost insure a general absence of the true spirit from the observance. Mahomet undertook to regulate the moments when every good Musselman must pray, and the consequence is, that there is a formal prostration all over the land, when the voice from the minarets proclaims the appointed minute. A Missionary to Syria says, "The Moslem prays just as a clock runs down, when it has been wound up. It is a motion of the lip, with which the heart has nothing to do." To insure the proper spirituality of fasting, we must leave it where the New Testament has left it—a voluntary service, prompted by the believer's heart and circumstances. It must be spontaneous and free. This is a vital point in any correct view of the Christian doctrine on this subject.

III. With this view of the duty and nature of Christian fasting, we are prepared to note *its Benefits*. Its uses strongly enforce its observance.

1. As a primary use, incidental to the very nature of the service, it is an appropriate confession of sin, and token of deep and humble repentance. The convicted Saul was three days without eating, Acts 9: 9. The natural effect of sorrow is to diminish appetite. Thus fasting is prompted by penitence and becomes its natural expression. In the Bible it appears largely as a sign of conscious unworthiness and humiliation before God. And under poignant consciousness of sin, and deep abhorrence of it, it is truly appropriate, like David, to chasten the soul with fastings. Such confession of sin is good for the soul, and part of that holy humbling which has the promise of a gracious exaltation.

2. It is helpful in overthrowing the dominion of the carnal nature. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit." Believers are divinely charged to "keep under the body and bring it into subjection." In this idea there is nothing like the old Gnostic heresy, that matter is essentially an evil principle, and that to liberate and elevate the soul, we must persecute, scourge, and lacerate the body. But it goes upon the Christian truth, that there are carnal, sinful tendencies in our fallen nature which are apt to get the mastery of us. The Scriptures call the carnal principle "the flesh." It is the bodily appetites, passions, lusts, and depravities. They ask

for indulgence, and their indulgence gives rise to many of the vices which afflict society, defy God, and wreck men's souls. This carnal principle, though its dominion is broken in the new-birth, has too much influence over even the pious. To mortify and subdue it, is the great object of the spiritual warfare, from the beginning to the close of the conflict. "I keep under my body," said the heroic and persevering Paul. He who indulges the flesh and pampers the appetite from day to day, nourishes an unfriendly principle and gives it strength and supremacy over his better part. He is helping nature to conquer grace. Hence it is found, that habitual luxury, and constant indulgence, are unfavorable to deep and lovely spirituality. Probably the whole history of the Christian church does not show an instance of their combination in the same person. It is true that most lovely piety often shines out in the midst of abounding affluence, but these instances are always marked with the spirit of self-denial. Indeed, we have here the very philosophy of the precept of self-denial. It is no useless self-punishment. It is a laying siege to a stronghold of evil in ourselves. It is the road to complete self-surrender. It is a process through which the grace of Christ binds the strong man and casts him out of his house. It is an assault of the Christian upon the forces of rebellion within him. It is a way of helping the regenerated soul through the strait gate of opposing sensualism, into the fulness of Christian liberty. Sin was lodged in man through eating, and still delights to maintain and strengthen itself through this means. Abstinence opposes the plan of sin. It interdicts the gratification of the flesh, in order to help the aspiring soul in the Godward direction. There is a peculiar food provided for the soul—the bread that has come down from heaven. There are men who abstain from the Eternal Bread and surrender themselves, body and soul, to the food of nature. And it is well for those who are aiming at the development of a life higher than nature, sometimes to abstain from nature's food and turn their longing appetite wholly to the bread of heaven. It is found helpful in fulfilling the charge, "Crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts." It assists in bringing "into subjection" those carnal tendencies that tempt and betray men into sin and vice. It tends directly to "keep under the body," to restrain carnal desires, counteract sensuality, and promote a holy superiority to all those fleshly lusts that war against the soul." This is a manifest utility of fasting.

3. It also aids devotion by contributing to the activity, vigor and clearness of the mind. There is a mysterious and intimate connection between the mind and body. Experience fully attests the fact that repletion is unfriendly to the highest and best exertions of the intellect. We are all familiar with the relation of dyspepsia to bad tempers, and of dulness to over-eating. So manifest is the influence, that some have imagined a great moral reformation by simple attention to medical dietetics. However extravagant such a notion may be, it is certain that if a man wants the clear, active, and successful use of his mind, he must abstain from indulgence. The Christian's "moderation" should always be known. Yet special fasting is, beyond all controversy, a good preparative to high intellectual effort or holy spiritual exercise. Thus it is the natural auxiliary of prayer and devotion. It unclogs the soul for its higher religious services. Pagan philosophers, when about to meet their opponents in public debate, entered the conflict fasting, to have the free, clear, full, and vigorous use of their minds. And shall not Christians sometimes use this means of enabling them to wait upon God with holy clearness and elevation of thought and affection? "Every man that striveth for the mastery," says Paul, referring to the racers in the Olympic games, "is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we are incorruptible," 1 Cor. 9 : 25.

4. It is evident, that fasting with prayer thus contributes to the higher attainments in piety. It is not to be understood that man has the power either by fasting or any other exercise, to do the work of his own sanctification. It is a divine work. Christ must ever be the believer's sanctification and the Holy Ghost, his sanctifier. Still the divine power works through means, and makes our own efforts and acts of devotion tributary to the result. And in the Scriptures, fasting is put in very close and significant association with eminent piety. Somewhat the best men of the Bible are mentioned as having practiced it. Perhaps their being the best is the reason of their practice. And surely their practice had some influence in making them such. The fact, at any rate is plain. The Saviour's words, "This kind can come forth by nothing but prayer and fasting," clearly connects it with extraordinary attainments and achievements. To it belong the mightier works of faith. On it attend the most marvellous achievements of grace. And it is worthy of note that "the three persons who appeared in the glory of the

mount of transfiguration had all performed the extraordinary fast of forty days—Moses, Elijah, and Christ.” It seems to be part of the plan of grace, that the road to pre-eminent attainments shall be through deep and earnest self-abasement. In a season of true fasting, there is peculiar earnestness of religious purpose and fixedness of aim, special heart-searching and crucifixion of sin, prayer and consecration to God, humiliation and hungering after righteousness, and all this must be helpful to Christian holiness. And were there more Christians whose piety would prompt them to fasting and prayer, and whose fasting and prayer would then react, with quickening power, on their piety, we would doubtless have more illustrations of high spiritual attainment—of men ascending the holy mount with Moses and Elijah and Christ.

Now if there is here presented to Christians a means of spiritual improvement, which they have overlooked, neglected, or perhaps despised, should they not correct their practice, and avail themselves of the attainable benefits? If ministers have left this duty untouched in the teachings of the pulpit, and been silent on this part of the counsel of God, should they not amend their way and give to fasting the same degree of prominence that the Scriptures do? It is easy to separate the Scriptural doctrine and practice, sustained by Christ and his apostles and the primitive Church, from the miserable perversion and counterfeit, exhibited in the Romish apostacy and the formal ritualism of the Episcopal Church. Though fasting is not meritorious, it may be profitable. We may have some sins, demons of pride, and avarice, and lust, and unbelief, that refuse to go out but by prayer and fasting. Let us not allow the body to reign over us. If man first symbolized and expressed his allegiance to Satan by eating, it is fitting, that, recalling that fact, we should sometimes refuse to eat, while we pray, “Lord, deliver us from evil.” May we not be stronger in the divine might, and more probably invincible, if, like Christ in the wilderness, we encounter our spiritual foes, after we have been strengthened by fasting and prayer?

Are there any less reasons for fasting now, than there were in former times, when Joshua, and Daniel, and Nehemiah, and Paul fasted? We have the desolations of Zion, and abounding sin, to call us to humiliation and prayer. We have personal, social, and national sins, to mourn over; and



the judgments of God are pressing us sorely. We have enough to weep and mourn and fast over before the Lord. And the days are here, in which the Bridegroom is taken away from us. Will we fulfil His word, "Then shall they fast in those days?"

ARTICLE V.

REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

LVII.

WILLIAM CARPENTER.

The name of William Carpenter will not soon be forgotten in the Lutheran Church. He was eminent, both for his public and private virtues; a man of deep piety and great usefulness, he impressed his character upon the generation, in the midst of which he lived, and left to the Church an inheritance, unsullied by a single stain. His memory is embalmed in many hearts, and will long continue to be cherished with gratitude and reverence.

He was born on the 20th of May, 1762, near Madison, Va., and was the son of William and Mary Carpenter, who were in regular communion with the Lutheran Church, and in early life inculcated upon him the obligations of religion. But of his childhood very little is known. In 1778, in the 16th year of his age, we find him with his brother entering the Revolutionary Army, filled with patriotic ardor, and deeply interested in the principles, involved in the issue. With scarcely a single exception our Lutheran population, at that early day, identified themselves with the interests of freedom, and were ever ready to pledge "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" in support of the holy cause. Earnestly they labored, bravely they fought and magnanimously they offered themselves as sacrifices on their country's altar in that great struggle, which achieved our independence. Young Carpenter was present at the surrender of Lord Cornwallis, and participated in other memorable scenes in our early history, which exerted an influence upon his future

character. He often, in after life, recounted the hardships which he and his fellow-soldiers endured and the great privations which they suffered, frequently subsisting two or three days, without their rations, and then receiving only a meagre allowance of corn-meal; this he would hastily mix with a little water in his handkerchief and, after covering it with oak leaves, would lay on a bed of warm coals, until it was baked. He partook of the homely meal with the greatest zest, and in the retrospect regarded it as the sweetest morsel he had ever eaten. How great the self-denial of our Revolutionary sires, how earnest their devotion to the cause they had espoused, how heroic their services for the support of principles, which, strange to say, some of their descendants, recreant to their trust, are attempting to subvert!

The subject of our sketch remained in the service of his country until the close of the War, and then having felt, that he was called to the ministry of reconciliation, he soon after commenced a course of preparation for the work. Reared under religious influences, and having been faithfully instructed in the precepts and duties of the Christian faith, he was early received, by the rite of Confirmation, into connexion with the Church. His Theological education was most probably conducted under the direction of Rev. Christian Streit,\* at the time the Pastor of the Lutheran Church in Winchester, Va., and he was licensed as a minister of the Gospel in the year 1787, by the Synod of Pennsylvania. The first sermon he preached was from the words: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." His first field of labor was in Madison county, Virginia, one of the oldest congregations in the country, having been organized during the period of our colonial history, and rich in association and incident. Here he continued twenty-six years, interested in his work and, the record says, earnest and faithful in the discharge of his duties, at times also having students of Divinity under his care; among the number the Rev. G. D. Flohr,† whose active missionary efforts in Western Virginia resulted in so much good. He would doubtless, have ended his days in this charge had not an importunate call from Kentucky been made for his services, which he could not find it in his heart to refuse. As early as the year 1805 a colony of Lutherans, members of his congregation in Madison, immigrated to the West. In the

\**Evangelical Review*, Vol. IX, p. 378. †*Evangelical Review*, Vol. X, p. 573.

wilderness they found no organized Church, no sanctuary, no ordinances, no religious privileges. Attached to the faith of their fathers, so soon as their cabins were erected, they resolved to hold religious meetings in private houses, and to encourage one another in their Christian profession, in the maintenance of their Christian integrity. These exercises were regularly held for nearly eight years, although they were without a minister. Subsequently they were organized into a Church. Mr. Carpenter visited them, catechised the children, and administered the Sacraments. But the members of the little flock were anxious to have a permanent Pastor settled among them, to break unto them the bread of life and minister to their spiritual wants. Under the circumstances Mr. Carpenter regarded it his duty to comply with their pressing request and to relinquish a field of labor, in which he was so pleasantly and usefully engaged. In 1813 he removed to the West and entered upon his second charge in Boone county, Kentucky. Here he exercised his ministry twenty years with patriarchal dignity and energy of purpose, till death transferred him to a higher sphere. He died at his residence, near Florence, on the 18th of February, 1833. Universal and profound was the impression of sadness which the bereavement produced in the community. Great and irreparable seemed the loss the Church had sustained in the removal from her service of one of her best Bishops.

The personal appearance of Mr. Carpenter was striking. He was above the ordinary height, tall and slender, and although he attained his three score years and ten he was rather delicate. His children and grand-children are, however, rarely surpassed in stature and physical strength. There was a defect in one of his eyes, which rendered its vision indistinct, but such was the piercing brightness of the other, that nature appeared to furnish an ample compensation for the deficiency. His countenance was very expressive and thoughtful and his manners pleasant and winning, although if occasion required, he could assume sufficient sternness and authority.

He was married in the year 1795 to Mary Aylor, who survived him, not quite two years. From this union there were eleven children, six of whom are still living.

Mr. Carpenter's ministry embraces a period of forty six years of faithful, pastoral and pædagogical labor, which enabled him

to show the Church and the world what manner of spirit he possessed, and to illustrate the power of the principles which he held. The testimony from both his charges is, that he was conscientious in the discharge of his duties, devoted to his work, a sincere, humble Christian, a man of kind heart, of a blameless life and a tireless hand. His character commanded respect, wherever he was known. Among his more prominent traits of character was the deep interest he evinced in the youth of his congregation, and the strong attachment he everywhere awakened. He was their warm friend and enjoyed their confidence. He delighted to notice them whenever he met them. They regarded him with a feeling of reverence, such as we vainly look for at the present time. He labored assiduously to promote their welfare, to benefit them by every means in his power. He dealt faithfully with their souls, never failing to remind them of duty, reprove delinquencies and to urge the truth. There are those still living who remember the opportune admonition, his faithful counsel, the well deserved rebuke. He was remarkable for his tact, and seemed always ready for the occasion. Once while he was preaching in the country, some thoughtless young men, instead of entering the Church at the appointed time, and quietly taking their seats, gathered at the door and annoyed the congregation. Suddenly he stopped and, raising his voice to its highest pitch, he cried out, "*Draussen sind die Hunde*" — Without are dogs. Such was his manner, such the force of his remark, that it operated like a charm. Order was at once restored. One of the party, now an elder in the Church, says he was so shocked at his conduct, that conviction seized hold of him and from that time he became thoughtful. He also knew so well how to encourage the young, to say the kind and appropriate word, which often proved, in its results, so fruitful of good. On a certain occasion, as he entered the church, meeting a young man, who was very regular in his attendance upon the exercises of the sanctuary and remarkably correct in his deportment, placing his hand on his head he said, "*Benjamin, du bist ein braver Bube*." That young man has become old and has filled many responsible offices. He is still actively engaged in the service of his Master, and often refers with satisfaction to the influence of this little incident in his early life. Mr. Carpenter was a most laborious, successful Catechist, and a zealous advocate of the system. He delivered lectures in the German and English language. His early ministerial

labors were confined to the German, but in 1820 he commenced preaching in English, because the interests of the Church demanded the change. He was at first violently opposed by some of his members, but when once satisfied, that the course was proper, nothing could deter him from carrying out what he believed was his duty. No man was more independent and fearless. No one was more unwilling than he to connive at even the appearance of evil. No one, more honest in expressing his convictions of truth, whether received or rejected by men. During a warmly contested election, as he was riding towards Burlington to exercise the elective franchise, he was met by two men, who stated they had bet a considerable amount as to the candidate for whom he would vote. The old gentleman replied that he regarded betting as a criminal practice, and exceedingly regreted that he had been the innocent cause of their wickedness. He instantly turned his horse's head and returned home without voting. Thus neither party won the bet, and a wholesome lesson was administered.

He was a man of great uniformity of character, very regular and exemplary in his habits, and of unimpeachable integrity, faithful to whatever trust was committed to him, unwearied in industry and unostentatious in his benevolence. He was incapable of doing any thing of doubtful propriety. He always moved in straight lines. He disclaimed petty intrigue, and scorned a mean action. His character for purity was above suspicion. He was remarkable for his love of truth, for his honesty and a sensitive regard for what is honorable and of good repute. He was frank, cheerful, generous and just. His habits of life were plain and simple, his affections, warm, earnest and manly. There are many incidents, illustrative of his peculiar traits of character given by those who were brought within the range of his influence. He was, even in his early day, interested in the study of Meteorology, and it was his practice every night before retiring to walk out and observe the clouds. One night he discovered that the door of his corn-crib was open, and on approaching the spot found a thief filling his bag. When the poor fellow ascertained that he was detected, he immediately commenced emptying the sack, but Father Carpenter directed him to fill it, and also helped him to put it on his horse. Now said the good man, "Go and steal no more!" As the perpetrator happened to be a near neighbor, whom he did



not wish to expose, he concealed his name even from his own family, and to this day it is unknown.

On the farm on which he lived, he raised more than was required for his own use. The surplus he disposed of, but he always had a fixed price for his corn. In his day he thought twenty-five cents a fair equivalent for a bushel. He would, however, never sell to speculators. On one occasion corn rose to one dollar per bushel; still he continued to sell in small quantities to his neighbors for twenty-five cents. Some speculators having heard this, brought their teams and proposed to take all that he had at that price. His reply was, "No, you cannot have it, at any price!"

He was distinguished for his love of country. This feeling was manifest on all occasions. He knew from personal experience the sacrifices and toil it required, how much it had cost to secure the blessings of freedom and independence. An actor in the scenes of the American Revolution, he appreciated the privileges which an American citizen enjoyed. The motto which he adopted indicated his ardent patriotism, his earnest devotion to freedom, as the prevailing sentiment of his heart. On the blank leaf of some of his books, are found inscribed the words, *Ubi libertas, ibi patria*. It was the same sentiment which his cotemporary Benjamin Franklin uttered in the Colonial Congress, before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, and repeated at the Court of France.

He continued a member of the Synod of Pennsylvania until his death, although in consequence of the remoteness of his field of labor from the place of meeting, and the few facilities afforded for travelling in those days, he was seldom present. In the *Minutes*, however, we find frequent allusion to his name, and such men, as Dr. Lochman and Dr. Schaeffer, appointed to write to him for the purpose of assuring him of the Synod's high regard and sincere sympathy with him in his labors. At the meeting in 1821, there is a reference to a communication received by the Synod from him, in which he speaks of the restoration of peace to the congregation after the disturbances, caused by the introduction of the English language into the services of the Church. He also states that, as his mind is now relieved from anxiety he has commenced to write a work upon the most important truths of the Christian religion, intended for plainer people.

He exercised the most affectionate personal faith in Christ as his atoning Saviour, and in God as his reconciled Father. He lived for the good of others and for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. When his work was done on earth and the message reached him, death had to him no terrors. That Jesus, whom he had so faithfully served and whom he had so earnestly commended to others, was near to uphold him and to give him the victory. He passed away, as he had lived, in perfect peace, in the full assurance of a peaceful rest beyond the grave.

## LXIII.

## JOHN CHRISTIAN WILLIAM YEAGER.

The subject of the present sketch was a native of Breslau, Prussia. He was born August 27th, 1783, and in his childhood immigrated to this country. He early connected himself with Zion's Church, Philadelphia, and for several years, gave instruction in the parochial school. Feeling that he was called to the work of the Christian ministry, he studied Theology under the direction of his Pastor, the Rev. Dr. Helmuth. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania, at its meeting in 1819.

Mr. Yeager, at the commencement of his ministry, took charge of our Lutheran interests in Bedford, where he continued in the faithful performance of his duties, until he was disabled by the inroads of disease. Night and day he was engaged in his mission, his errand of love, and many souls were given to his ministry. He was emphatically the Apostle of Lutheranism in Bedford county, and, to his efforts the most of the churches in that region owe their origin. In 1840 he relinquished his connexion with the Bedford, Schells-burg, and other churches, and the last few years of his life his labors were confined to Friends' Cove and the immediate vicinity. His health had become very much impaired by his onerous and manifold duties. His physical constitution gradually began to yield under the influence of excessive labor and constant exposure, a ministry of so much care and toil. The last year of his life, he was very feeble, yet he was still anxious to be employed in the service of his Master, the great work, to which he had consecrated his powers. When he could no longer go out among his people he was in the habit of sending to individuals the publications

of the American Tract Society, writing with his pencil on the margin of the Tract some suitable text of Scripture, or a word of admonition or encouragement. To all who visited him at his home, he had some message from the Gospel to present, some comforting or instructive truth to offer, and by his patience and meekness, his gentleness and goodness, his beautiful and holy example, showed the sincerity of his principles and the influence of religion. He met the final summons not only with quiet submission but with Christian triumph, bearing the most unequivocal testimony to the Redeemer's all-sustaining power and grace, and anticipating with joy the glorious rest, to which death would introduce him. He died April 17th, 1844, in the 62nd year of his age. He was buried beside the Church edifice at Friends' Cove, a large concourse of sorrowing friends, in whose grateful hearts he still lived, gathering around his grave to testify their grief. The solemn occasion was improved by appropriate discourses, delivered by Rev. W. G. Laitzle of the Lutheran, and Rev. J. Ziegler, of the German Reformed Church.

Mr. Yeager was of medium height, but slender, and rather delicately than robustly formed. His voice was feeble, alternated to an unusual degree of fineness, softness and sweetness. Perhaps, it was this that gave origin to the sobriquet of *The sweet preacher of Bedford*, by which he was so generally known. His hair was very black, retaining its color, till the last. He always wore the white cravat, and the black coat which reached down half-way below his knees. In his dress he was neat, without being finical, and presented a marked appearance.

He was twice married. His first wife was the widow Cruse. From this marriage there were two children, William Yeager, M. D. and Godfrey Yeager. He was married, a second time, to Mary Magdalene, the widow of Jacob Schaffer. She survived him several years and recently died, April 4th, 1863, in the 89th year of her age.

Mr. Yeager was highly esteemed for his excellent personal qualities. He was a man of warm and genial spirit, of affectionate disposition, of great tenderness and love, a model of meekness and patience. His heart was as simple and as transparent, as childhood. No one ever suspected him of a sinister motive, of a disingenuous act, or apprehended at his hands the least injustice or wrong. All who knew him loved him. "He was the best man," writes one, "I ever met, so

tender and lovely, so heavenly-minded and apparently walking so near heaven, that I scarcely hope to see his like in this world. He was as much like St. John, as I can well conceive. Few men have lived who had the power to attract more strongly or to bind more tenderly to his own the hearts of warm and loving friends. He was a father to his people, the old rejoiced in him as a friend, the children loved him as a parent, and you could often see him walking the streets with a dozen or more hanging around him, some having hold of his hands and others, of his coat, frisking and playing beneath his smiles. No one could know him without loving him. He was the idol of his family. Any person who wished to see a miniature of heaven had only to spend a few days under his hospitable roof. Such simplicity, affection and harmony are not often met with, in this world."\* He was a good man, an earnest living Christian, illustrating in his own life the power and blessedness of the Gospel and uniting with sincere humility active usefulness; visiting the widow and the fatherless in their affliction, he kept himself unspotted from the world. Kind and considerate in his intercourse, affable and always amiable, the savor of his lovely temper rested upon every circle in which he mingled, his example was a regular sermon, his presence a continual benediction. A life so pure and consistent, so much under the control of a meek and benevolent spirit secured for him the most unlimited confidence and sincere affection. He loved the work, to which he had consecrated his life. His whole heart was in the service. He deeply felt the responsibility of his position and was ever diligent in promoting the prosperity of Zion. Preaching Christ was his constant employment, his chief pleasure. Although his field of labor embraced a large territory, which rendered it necessary for him to be constantly in his saddle, yet he never seemed to grow weary. It was quite common for him in filling an appointment in some distant congregation to rise at midnight and start on his journey. He was indefatigable in his labors. His heart went forth in tender sympathy with his flock, and the salvation of souls was the one idea, the single purpose of his ministry. His preaching was characterized by great simplicity and directness. No one could plead more earnestly with sinners, or present more comforting truths to

\*Rev. D. H. Focht, New Bloomfield, Pa.

the distressed than he, or awaken in the hearts of believers a greater hungering and thirsting after righteousness, a deeper work of grace and a more intimate communion with God. And his words, which came warm, glowing from the heart, his manner, tones of voice, attitude, were in entire keeping with the service he was rendering to God. He was, as might be expected, eminently successful, not only in guiding inquirers and leading the people of God to higher attainments in piety, but his religious activity was, with the divine blessing, the means of salvation, perhaps, to thousands of souls. His ministry was attended with many powerful effusions of the Holy Spirit and abounded in the most remarkable fruits, the result, as it seemed, of that intense, whole-hearted devotion to the good of his fellow-men and the glory of God, which was the crowning excellence of his life. In the extent, variety and usefulness of his labors he evidently followed the foot-steps of Him, who went about doing good. The influence of his life is still felt, wherever he was known, and an impression of moral worth, heavenly-mindedness, unwavering faith and apostolic zeal has been produced upon the tablet of the memory, which time can never efface. The life of such a man is a blessing to any community, his death a public calamity.

FROM THE REV. HENRY HAVERSTICK,

PROFESSOR IN THE PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL.

PHILADELPHIA, May 27th, 1863.

My Dear Sir: There is no minister of our Church, in the past generation, whose memory I cherish with so much reverence and love. When I was laboring in my first pastoral charge, he was my nearest clerical neighbor, at the distance of thirty miles. But, notwithstanding the distance, he became my dear friend and wise counsellor.

Unless I am mistaken, brother Yeager received his scientific and theological training in the Prussian University, at Breslau. Hence he was qualified, in many respects, for eminence and prominence in the Church. But his actual field of labor was, comparatively, obscure; it extended over a rugged district of country, where the intelligence of the people was very limited; and it compelled the pastor to spend a large proportion of his time in the saddle, and not in the study. For example he could not leave his residence in Friends' Cove, without crossing a range of lofty mountains. Then he entered the upper valley of the Juniata, abounding with rough slopes and rocky acclivities. If he proceeded thence to his most distant congregation in Morrison's Cove, he was obliged to cross another range of mountains, more lofty than the first. Thus the transit from the starting-point to the resting-place occupied a large portion of an October day. Of this I can speak from personal experience.



All this, however, was of little moment to one, whose whole heart and soul were in his work. Although never vigorous in body, and at the time of my intimacy decidedly infirm in health, he did not spare his strength, he did not seek to avoid cold or heat, rain or snow. In fact, at the time of my visit to Morrison's Cove, the patriarch of the congregation, who was also our host, assured me, that brother Yeager, unless really sick at home, had never failed to keep every appointment, no matter for what purpose it had been made.

This was one cause of the success of our dear brother, in winning souls to Christ. But there was nothing in his exterior, for this was not even prepossessing to strangers. There was nothing in his pulpit-performances, as far as they addressed themselves merely to the eye and the ear, for his voice was weak, the flow of his words was somewhat broken, and the grace of action was entirely wanting. But he had the more rare gift of presenting thoughts, always earnest in their nature, often profound, always sanctified to their proper end. These were clothed in language, whose very essence was simplicity, so that even a child could understand their import. At the same time they took hold of the heart, because they came warm and flowing from the heart. In fact his appeals, in this respect, were often so irresistible, that I used to compare them to arrows, shot from a well-strung bow, always reaching the conscience, and always causing a deep conviction, that this was a heavenly-minded man.

Time and again, it was my privilege to be with brother Yeager in his family circle, where (for he had married the second time) it was not impossible for occasions of strife or discord to arise. But no where did he enjoy a larger measure of confidence, reverence and love than among those who saw him most frequently, and knew him most intimately. No where have I seen the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, diffusing its influence more thoroughly and harmoniously over an entire household.

Away from the family circle I rode with him on horseback for days in succession. But, as we rode along, I listened with wonder to a constant flow of masterly thoughts and novel ideas, sometimes interspersed with mirthful illustrations, always manifesting the philosopher, the scholar, and the Christian gentleman.

Upon more than one occasion I united with him in the solemn services of the sanctuary, where I saw the wonderful effects that sometimes result from the combined power of childlike simplicity and fervid zeal. This was remarkably the case upon the last occasion when I saw this beloved brother. We had been holding sacramental services in Bedford; and these were accompanied by religious exercises for several successive days. The delivery of the last sermon had been assigned to me; and I believe that I preached with some degree of earnestness and solemnity. But the object was not accomplished, until our dear brother Yeager rose to apply and impress the word that had been spoken. He frankly disclaimed all power of speech, such as men call eloquence; but with such powers as he possessed, he earnestly demanded a hearing, in the name of the living God. Nor was the appeal a fruitless one. In a few minutes the ice was melted; strong hearts were broken; and an earnest cry for mercy pervaded the large congregation.

I did not think that that would be our last meeting upon earth; but I do not grieve that it was so. It is rather a sweet and pleasant reminiscence, that I left my brother absorbed in the great work of his life, adding to the large number of redeemed spirits, who, in the better land, will give the honor, due to their beloved and devoted pastor.

Yours sincerely,

HENRY HAVERSTICK.

FROM THE REV. S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

GETTYSBURG, PA., June 10th, 1863.

Dear Brother: In reply to your request to furnish some reminiscences of the Rev. William Yeager, I remark that my acquaintance with him commenced, whilst I was a student in the University of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, in 1816. For several years we had frequent interviews at the meetings of the "Mosheim Debating Society" of the Lutheran Church, held in the Congregational School-house on Cherry street; and for twenty-five years afterwards, we occasionally met at Synod. Brother Yeager, intellectually considered, was not a great man, nor were his theological attainments extensive or his preaching powers of a superior order. But he was eminently "*a good man and full of the Holy Ghost*," and "*an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile*."

In disposition he was rather diffident and retiring; but the love of Christ constrained him to incessant solicitude for the good of souls. The earlier years of his life he spent as teacher in one of the German congregational schools in Philadelphia, where he was distinguished for his fidelity and zeal for the welfare and improvement of his pupils. After he removed to the interior of Pennsylvania and entered the ministry, he was equally distinguished for his devotedness to his Master's work. In the pulpit, as well as out of it, he was characterized by a childlike simplicity of manner, and an unfeigned humility, which not only disarmed all criticism, but also opened the way to the hearts of his hearers, and often enabled him to make a deep impression on them. Without having studied the rule of Horace, "*Si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi*," he forcibly exemplified it. When preaching of the love of Christ to our fallen race, he often wept himself; until few of his hearers could abstain from tears. And his entreaties to sinners to embrace the Saviour, were uttered with such manifest sincerity, and urged with such importunate solicitude of manner, that his preaching was often attended with the happiest effects. On the whole, I doubt not, the salutation of the Master may justly be applied to him, "*Well done good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord*."

Fraternally yours,

S. S. SCHMUCKER.

## ARTICLE VI.

### DR. JOHNSON: HIS WORKS AND HIS REVIEWERS.

By S. Austin Allibone. LL. D., Philadelphia.

"Sir William Temple was the first writer who gave cadence to English prose. Before his time, they were careless of arrangement, and did not mind whether a sentence ended with an important word, or an insignificant word, or with what part of speech it was concluded." A favorite style of Dr. Johnson's was the Anglo-Latin of Sir Thomas Browne, whose "Christian Morals" he edited (with a life of the author) in 1756. The "Monthly Review" for May expresses the opinion that "The Compiler of Sir Thomas' life has animated his narration with many spirited and judicious remarks: as might indeed, be expected from the known abilities of Mr. Johnson." It is natural for us to imitate that which we admire, and if the editor did learn *pondera verborum* from his author he was not illy compensated for his labors. And here, had we space, we should engage in doughty warfare with those hypercritics who took the doctor to task for what they call the introduction of Latinisms, and the excessive use of antitheses. Those who produce the charge of word-making, will have to revive their knowledge of early English vocabularies. But where had been the mighty fault if the author of the first good English Dictionary—the census-taker of our verbal forces—had naturalized a few of the Ancient Romans, and made good English subjects of them? Is it heresy for our language to be accretive? Then let those who are so fond of "Anglo-Saxon undefiled," amuse themselves, "o' nights," with a page or two of Aldhelm, Ceolfrid of Wearmouth, or Felix of Croyland. Let them read to their families, for week day entertainment, King Alfred's Orosius, and wind up the devotions of the Sabbath with the royal translator's Psalms of David, or the good Alfrie's "Paschal Homily." But, no; our learned philologer does not object to an increase of verbal wealth, in general, he only censures an accretion by items, and by individual authority. But, surely, this is paradoxical. Shall we, then, import a language, bodily, under the *imprimatur* of a philological col-

lege, and shall we deny the privilege of membership, only because we happen to know the name of the sponsor? Is the new-born infant to be rejected if we have proof of its respectable parentage, but clasped to our bosoms because a foundling? This is about the weight of the arguments of our erudite censors. It may be very well to tell us that unexceptionable words (as regards the *unde derivatur*) are plenty enough for those who know how to use them. It may sound very conclusive to quote Horace at us, "*Verba provisam rem non invita sequuntur*;" but who more ready to borrow from the Greek, when it suited his purpose, than the satirist himself? Moreover, Horace evidently refers to a copious vocabulary *already formed*, and *however formed*, as Cicero's "*Rerum copia*, &c. If we can by judicious naturalization, improve our population, will the wise patriot wall up our coasts? If we add to the happiness of our family circle by harmonious intermarriages, who shall forbid the bans? And, on the same principle, if we can enlarge the agencies of thought by a fuller vocabulary, which shall afford us expressive synonyms, relieve tautology by a chaste metonymy, and enable us to embody the nicer shades of meaning, without verbiage, we shall not be wise if we refuse such treasures, and put a padlock upon our petrified Lexicons! The Birmingham axe is a useful implement, and answers most valuable purposes; but am I therefore to discard the surgeon's lancet, or the soldier's flexible blade? I shall adopt the two latter, although the one be forged in France, and the other wrought in Damascus.

We have little disposition to dwell upon Doctor Johnson as a commentator upon Shakspeare. We will fight manfully for the preface, but after *that*, the point of our lance acknowledges the influence of the attraction of gravitation, and bends earthward. Francis Douce, one of the most erudite of literary antiquarians, thus despatches the critical Doctor, in a few words much to the purpose: "The indefatigable exertions of Messrs. Steevens, Malone, Tyrwhitt, and Mason, will ever be duly appreciated by the true and zealous admirers of Shakspeare's pages. If the name of a celebrated critic and moralist be not included on this occasion, it is because he was certainly unskilled in the knowledge of obsolete customs and expressions. His explanatory notes, therefore, are, generally speaking, the most controvertible of any; but no future editor will discharge his duty to the public, who

shall omit a single sentence of this writer's masterly preface, or of his sound and tasteful characters of the plays of Shakspeare." Again: "No disparagement is meant to the memory or talents of one of the greatest of men, when a protest is here entered against the text of Dr. Johnson."

We well remember our astonishment at Johnson's criticism upon Proteus' speech in the "Two Gentlemen of Verona," where he charges Shakspeare with a blunder in making the enamoured young gallant say

"'Tis but her picture I have yet beheld,  
And that hath dazzled my reason's light."

"Why," says the Doctor, "he had had an interview with Silvia, and yet talks of having only seen her picture!" The literal commentator did not make sufficient allowance for the rhetoric of lovers. That there should be much good reading, and much good sense, contained in such a body of notes by such a writer, is a matter of course. The errors and misconceptions which prove the critic's unfitness for his task, afford another proof of what even wise men often forget, that *no amount of genius, no extent of general knowledge, will qualify an author for a particular field without particular preparation.* The "Monthly Review," vol. 33. for 1765, devotes no less than thirty pages to a notice of Johnson's Shakspeare. Our extracts from this critique must be brief, which is the more annoying from the many remarks we should like to quote. "We cannot help thinking it, therefore, a misfortune almost as singular as his [Shakspeare's] merit, that, among so many ingenious scholiasts that have employed themselves in elucidating his writings, barely one of them hath been found in any degree worthy of him. They all seem to have mistaken the route, in which only they could do honor to themselves, or be useful to the reader. Engaged in the piddling task of adjusting quibbles, and restoring conundrums, they have neglected the illustration of characters, sentiments, and situations. Instead of aspiring to trim the ruffled bays that have a little obscured his brow, they have been laboriously and servilely employed in brushing the dirt from his shoes. Instead of strewing flowers and planting fresh laurels, on his tomb, they have been irreverently trampling down the turf, that had otherwise covered his dust with perpetual verdure." This bears rather hard upon Johnson's predecessors, the principal of whom were, Rymer, 1678; Gildon, 1694; Denni,



1693; Pope, 1725; Theobald, 1726; Peck, 1740; Sir Thos. Hamner, 1745; Grey, 1746; Warburton, 1747; Upton, 1748; Whalley, 1748; Edwards, 1748; Holt, 1749; Charlotte Lennox, 1753-4; Cooper, 1755; Howard, 1756; Capell, 1759; Heath, 1765 (the year in which Johnson's edition appeared). In a future paper we may, perhaps, take into consideration the merits of some of these commentators; at present we have our hands more than full with the corpulent Doctor. From the above rough handling of Shaksperian critics, we can infer nothing as to the Reviewer's opinion of the present commentator: he may go on to say—"although *these* have so signally failed, we have, at last, a commentator worthy of the name. Johnson has admirably succeeded, where others have ignominiously come short &c. "He *might* have said this, true; but he says nothing of the kind; *au contraire*, he rates the great man as soundly as he had censured his forerunners. "From the present editor, it is true, we had hoped better things. But what shall we say? when he himself confesses, that, as to the poetical beauties or defects of his author, he hath not been very diligent to observe them: having given up this part of his design to chance and caprice. This is surely a strange concession to be made by the author of the proposals for printing this work by subscription! \* \* But perhaps our editor found the task, of commenting on Shakspeare as a *poet* much more difficult than he had conceived it to be. \* \* We find little in the first five pages of our editor's preface, but trite and common place reflections, on our veneration for antiquity, and on the general talents of Shakspeare; delivered in that pompous style which is so peculiar to himself, and is so much admired by some kind of readers. In some places, however, he is less verbose; and then he is generally sensible, instructive and entertaining." The Reviewer makes the following fair hit at the editor's castigation of Shakspeare's punning propensities. Johnson remarks that, "A quibble is the golden apple for which he will always turn aside from his career, or step from his elevation. A quibble, poor and barren it is, gave him such delight, that he was content to purchase it, by the sacrifice of reason, propriety, and truth. A quibble was to him the fatal Cleopatra for which he lost the world, and was content to lose it." To which the Reviewer responds, "Doth not this whole paragraph (not all quoted above) serve egregiously to prove,

that, altho' our editor may not be fond of downright punning, he takes full as much delight in starting and hunting down a poor conceit, as he affirms Shakspeare did? We will venture to assert, indeed, that this is a species of quibbling, which, barren and pitiful as it is, seems to give the critic himself so much delight, that *he* is content to purchase it by the sacrifice of reason, propriety and truth." Again: "He shows, himself to be as indifferent a pleader *for* Shakspeare as he hath proved *against* him. Nay, we entertain some opinion that the critical Reader will, on a due consideration of what is hereafter advanced, be apt to think Dr. Johnson too little acquainted with the nature and use of the drama, to engage successfully in a dispute of so much difficulty as that which relates to the breach or observation of the dramatic unities." Let not our reader be alarmed by the mention of that time-seasoned war cry to classic battle—the unities. We are not about to plunge him into the subject. For this moderation he may thank us, when we tell him that our Reviewer, after laboring through no less than six pages on the topic, promises the enchanted reader that he will "call again," and resume the subject in a future number. To quote this cheering and refreshing promise *verbatim*, "But we shall here take leave of this performance for the present; deferring our farther remarks, on the editor's misapprehension of the dramatic unities, to another opportunity." Let us not be suspected of depreciating our critic's labors, but "life is short," and Reviews "are long;" and so, indeed, are we, our reader may exclaim: no, men do not exclaim when they are sleeping; so, then, may our reader drawl. The critic keeps his word. He *does* resume the subject, with a witness! Having got the doctor on the floor, he never thinks he has pummelled him enough. "Come on, Macduff!" is the challenge of defiance; and at him he goes, with unity of time, and unity of place, for seven more mortal pages! The doctor had remarked that, "It is false that any representation is mistaken for reality; that any dramatic fable in its materiality was ever credible, or, for a single moment, was ever credited. The objection arising from the impossibility of passing the first hour at Alexandria, and the next at Rome, supposes, that when the play opens the spectator really imagines himself at Alexandria, and believes that his walk to the theatre has been a voyage to Egypt, and that he lives in the days of Antony and Cleopatra." Surely he that

imagines this may imagine more. He that can take the stage at one time for the palace of the Ptolemies, may take it in half an hour for the promontory of Actium. Delusion, if delusion be admitted, has no certain limitation; if the spectator can be once persuaded, that his old acquaintances are Alexander and Caesar, that a room illuminated with candles is the plain of Pharsalia, or the bank of Granicus, he is in a state of elevation above the reach of reason, or of truth, and from the heights of empyrean poetry, may despise the circumspection of terrestrial nature. There is no reason why a mind thus wandering in ecstacy, should not be a century in that exultant of the brains that can make the stage a field. The truth is, that the spectators are always in their senses, and know, from the first act to the last, that the stage is only a stage, and that the players are only players. They come to hear a certain number of lines recited with just gesture and elegant modulation. The lines relate to some action, and an action must be in some place: but the different actions that complete a story may be in places very remote from each other: and where is the absurdity of allowing that space to represent first, Athens, and then, Sicily, which was always known to be neither Sicily, nor Athens, but a modern theatre? \* \* If, in the first act, preparations for war against Mithridates are represented to be made in Rome, the event of the war, may, without absurdity, be represented in the catastrophe, as happening in Pontus, we know that there is neither war, nor preparation for war: we know that we are neither in Rome nor Pontus; that neither Mithridates nor Lucullus are before us."

Now, miserably stupid that we are! shall we say that, to us, the doctor's remarks seem very much to the —? But, no, we shall not compromise ourselves. We know how warm the blood gets in these classical tugs, and we all remember that "When *Greek* meets *Greek*, then comes the tug of war." If we proclaim ourselves a unity man, some bigoted anti-unity champion may despatch to the office that awful *cartel* the "natural enemy" of publishers, "stop my magazine!" Or, again, should we snap our fingers at the unities, a respectful query may be proposed to the Bæotian authorship of this series of papers. Therefore, professing the utmost respect for each learned Hellenist, we proceed to see with what vast deference the doctor's arguments were received by the Reviewer. "Plausible as these arguments may at first sight appear, we will venture to say there is hardly one of

them that does not seem false, or foreign to the purpose." Again, this staunch champion of Aristotle and Horace remarks, "It is surely as difficult for the spectator to conceive himself actually at Elsinore, while he is sitting in Drury Lane theatre, as it is for him to imagine Mr. Garrick, whose face he knows very well, and who talks plain English, should be really Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Dr. Johnson, therefore, may fully prove the impossibility of the drama's being, in its *materiality*, credited, and yet by no means exculpate Shakspeare in the breach of the dramatic unities."

In an other place we have given some account of Dr. W. T. Kenrick, the author of the savage attack upon Goldsmith's "Enquiring into Polite Learning." This Ishmaelite was still at large, and soon pounced upon the new edition of Shakspeare; and in the "Monthly Review" for December, 1765, we find a notice of "A Review of Dr. Johnson's New Edition of Shakspeare: In which the Ignorance or Inattention, of that editor is exposed, and the poet defended from the persecution of his commentators, by W. Kenrick." Now the "Monthly Review," as we have seen, had been sufficiently severe upon the editor; but, whether, as Johnson said of himself with respect to Goldsmith, they would not let any one abuse the doctor beside themselves, or because they thought Kenrick unjust, certain it is, they gave the critic as good as he sent. They speak of "the rough attack which the author of the critical performance now before us hath made on a gentleman of established literary reputation. The *Reviewer* seems to be one of those violent assailants whose aim is not merely to vanquish, but even to *exterminate* his antagonist. With him, it is not enough that the editor of Shakspeare be proved to have mistaken his own powers and qualifications, when he undertook that arduous task, in which greater men than Dr. Johnson failed of success, but he must also be exposed as a very *pretender* to all literature and science. (See p. 54: where Mr. K. says, it does not appear to him that Dr. J. is master of any one science or any one language.) This is really outrageous! What must the impartial reader think of such extravagance? What, but that Mr. Kenrick is, in controversy, what the North American Indians are in war; and comes armed with the tomahawk and scalping knife, to slay and to strip the slain, with the barbarity of a Mohawk or a Cherokee."



Kenrick admits that he "can readily foresee, that he shall be thought to have treated both Dr. Johnson and Dr. Warburton with an ill-becoming levity, if not with unmerited severity. \* \* That he may not be suspected, however, of attempting to injure either from a principle of spleen or resentment, he can safely aver, with regard to both; what another of Dr. Warburton's antagonist's hath declared in respect to him alone; i. e. "That he is personally a stranger to either of these gentlemen; never conversed with them; never saw them; never had the least communication with them of any kind; never hath received or solicited any favor from either; nor, on the other hand, have ever been personally disoblged by them; so that it is impossible this proceeding can have been influenced either by disappointment or resentment." Kenrick then proceeds in this cruel style, "The truth is, that the Reviewer hath always understood it to be an established law in the republic of letters, wisely calculated to restrain the excesses of insult, petulance and ill nature, too apt to shoot up in the splenetic recesses of solitary literature, that every writer should be treated on the same foot of civility, in which, when unprovoked by prior ill usage, he hath been accustomed to treat others. Now, whether he hath treated either of these gentlemen worse than they have treated Shakspeare, he dares appeal to the impartiality of the public; which at whatever low estimation it may rate an author, who hath never set his name to a book; it will hardly think there can be a greater difference between him and this *par nobile fratrum* of commentators, than there is between them and the inimitable writer on whose works they have so freely commented. If the Reviewer hath at any time, indeed, behaved towards these gentlemen with little ceremony, it hath always been when they deserved much less; for it is to be observed, he had nothing to do with the political character of either. He did not think it necessary, therefore, to pay any deference to Dr. Johnson, as his Majesty's pensioner; [unkind cut, oh! savage Kenrick!] nor to Dr. Warburton, as Bishop of Gloucester. Their literary character was all that concerned him: and even, viewing them in this light, he had to respect them only as commentators on Shakspeare. "We would fain linger here, but our limits forbid. Kenrick had a great advantage in criticising these commentators; for assuredly both Johnson and Warburton mistook their vocation when they attempted to illustrate the "immortal bard!"



In the *Monthly Review*, vol. 34, (1766) we find a notice of "A defence of Mr. Kenrick's Review of Dr. Johnson's Shakspeare, containing a number of curious and ludicrous Anecdotes of Literary Biography. By a Friend." The *Monthly Review* remarks: "Those who are the most ready to give offence, by too unguarded a freedom of behaviour, are ever the most impatient to rebuke; and therefore we are not at all surprised to find Mr. K., or his sanguine friend, Mr. R. R. (whoever may be the real author of this pamphlet,) warmly resenting our mild reprehension of Mr. K.'s *rough* attack on the editor of Shakspeare. But it were not wonderful if he should appear to be *nettled*; for he has been stung by a whole nest of literary hornets. He has been attacked, in his turn, by an army of scribblers; and he may possibly have enough to do, to rout them all, notwithstanding his boasted prowess, and his avowed contempt for a myriad of cockle-shell critics: i. e. Reviewers, Magazines, Chroniclers, versemen, and prosemen,—all armed and ranged under the standard of General Johnson. The General, indeed, hath not yet vouchsafed to stir out of his camp; but seems content, for the present at least, with detaching his light troops to harass the enemy."

We may be sure that Johnson's friends were not disposed to sit quietly whilst their leader was thus violently attacked. The war raged so furiously, that the *Monthly Review*, after having vainly read the riot act to the excited combatants, in the June number of the same year, beseeches them to keep the peace:—"An examination of Mr. Kenrick's Review of Mr. Johnson's edition of Shakspeare. That Mr. K. attacked the editor of Shakspeare in such a manner as justly gave offence to every candid reader, is a truth which we believe very few will dispute. For this he has been frequently reprehended by several of the learned editor's friends; whose faint and distant efforts, however, seem to have indicated their fear of coming to close quarters with this furious combatant: but in the present Examiner, we think he hath indeed met with his match, in every respect. If Mr. K. hath grossly treated Mr. Johnson,—in return our anonymous author does not spare Mr. K. but falls on without mercy, retorting on him, as the aggressor in this scandalous controversy, all his virulence and outrage. But what hath Shakspeare to do in this chimney-sweepers warfare? Can the difficulties in his immortal writings be solved, and his obscurities illustrated, no where but in *St. Giles*? For shame, gentlemen! If

ye are ambitious of being regarded as gentlemen, do not continue to disgrace the name of literature by such unlettered behaviour! What will the learned abroad, think ye, conclude, if they should chance to hear of your illiberal altercations,—what but that the *literati* of this country, instead of quaffing inspiration at the pure spring of Helicon, had inebriated themselves in the filthy kennels of Grub street?

In 1770, the Doctor must needs meddle with the Wilkes and Luttrell controversy, which he had better have let alone. The exclusion of Wilkes, notwithstanding his large majority of votes, was deemed a violation of the rights of electors; and an alarm for the constitution was entertained throughout the country. The Doctor issued what he intended as a *sermon*, entitled “The False Alarm,” justifying the conduct of the ministry. The pamphlet had a large circulation: viz. 1st edition, Jan. 16th; 2nd, Feb. 6th; and a third, March 13th. Champions on the other side were not wanting, and they did not spare the advocate of the ministry. The author of “The Crisis, in answer to the False Alarm,” writes his *brochure* to show “what astonishing absurdities a blind and servile dependence on ministerial power, will betray the unhappy wretch into, that defends it.” The author of “A Letter to Samuel Johnson, LL. D.” is equally complimentary. “You have ambitiously declared yourself the spitter-forth of that effusion of servility and bombast, and you could not have been concealed.” We may be sure that the “pension” was not forgotten by this amiable scribe. In the next year the Doctor again came to the rescue of the ministry, in his “Thoughts on the late Transactions respecting Falkland’s Islands;” which pamphlet elicited a “A Refutation of ‘Thoughts &c.’ In a letter addressed to the Author, and dedicated to Dr. Samuel Johnson.” The Monthly Review considers that, “This publication fully refutes the fallacious reasonings employed in Dr. J’s. pamphlet, and exposes the disingenuity of the Author.”

On the dissolution of Parliament, in 1774, Dr. Johnson again took up the cudgel for the Tories: and in “The Patriot,” addressed to the electors of Great Britain, he attempts to justify the ignoring of the Middlesex election, and the war against the North American colonies. Answers soon appeared in the “Remarks on the Patriot,” and “A Letter to Dr. Samuel Johnson, occasioned by his late Political publications.” The author of the latter does not mince matters, but tells the min-

isterial champion,—“Though you have given evidence of great force and genius, you have, at the same time, discovered such little prejudices, and such bigoted attachments, as would have disgraced a common understanding.”

As the Doctor had declared as early as 1769, of the Americans,—“Sir, they are a race of convicts, and ought to be thankful for anything we allow them short of hanging,—we need not be surprised if six years later he was ready to answer the united complaints of the convicts in Congress assembled. This response appeared under the title of “Taxation no Tyranny; an answer to the Resolutions and Address of the American Congress.” Many pages would be required to give even a hasty view of the controversy which was elicited by this “Answer.” It was published March 7th, (1775,) and in the “Monthly Review” for May, above we find the following responses noticed: 1. An Answer to a Pamphlet, entitled “Taxation no Tyranny,”—addressed to the Author, and to Persons in Power.” This critic is not at all pleased with the pamphlet which he reviews. He declares,—“Though every part of your publication breathes nothing but the spirit of Tyranny, yet there is one passage so audacious, that it deserves to be distinguished. In your 24th page you have these words; ‘An *English Individual* may by the supreme authority be deprived of liberty, and a liberty divested of its powers, for reasons of which that authority is the *solo* judge.’ If one Individual, or one Colony, can be thus deprived, so may all the Colonies together; so may every man in the community. For I defy any man to show where any limitation exists, if any such power be admitted.”

2. Tyranny Unmasked: An Answer to a late Pamphlet entitled, “Taxation no Tyranny.” This author expresses great confidence in the constancy and courage of the Americans. “I have no doubt, if no better alternative be given them, that not only the heroes of Boston, but the much quieter heroes of Philadelphia, will show themselves ready to suffer all things, and *be free*.”

3. Taxation Tyranny: Addressed to Samuel Johnson, LL. D.” Of this the “Monthly Review” remarks: “The style and arguments of this performance frequently deserve commendation; but passages sometimes occur in it, which discover the Author to have not been sufficiently informed of the facts relating to the subjects in dispute.

4. The Pamphlet entitled ‘Taxation no Tyranny,’ candidly considered, and its arguments and pernicious doctrines ex-

posed and refuted ! "This refutation is extended to almost every sentence of its antagonist's performance. It is, however, generally too cursory, and the writer frequently hastens from one argument to another, before he has exhausted the subject ; and we fear sometimes before he has convinced his readers."

5. "Resistance no Rebellion ; In answer to Dr. Johnson's Taxation no Tyranny." This critic answers the Doctor by way of parody. We need not tell our readers that the "American controversy" was the great theme of the day. Some of the warmest champions of the Colonies, fought for America, directly under the shadow of the British throne.

Mr. Andrew Henderson received with great disgust the Doctor's opinion of matters and things, as recorded in the "Journey to the Western Isles." He addressed a letter to the traveller, which was thus briefly despatched by the *Monthly Review*, April, 1775 :

"The Frog contending with the Ox."

Months rolled away, and the only answer which Mr. Henderson received was (to indulge in a bull) that most cutting one, none at all. Not disposed to let matters pass by so quietly, in July was published, "A Second Letter to Dr. Samuel Johnson, in which his wicked and opprobrious Invectives are shewn, &c., by Andrew Henderson, Author of the former "letter." The Reviewers comforted him in his troubles as little as before ; they only remark "The Ox has not yet set his foot upon the Frog." In the next month's Review we find that "Taxation no Tyranny" was still vexing the public mind, or certainly the author of *Regulus* could not "sleep on it !"

"A Defence of the Resolutions and Address of the American Congress ; in reply to Taxation no Tyranny, by the author of *Regulus*." This pamphlet contains many very harsh and some very just strictures on the doctrines and tenets ascribed to Dr. J. and which has already been honored with unmerited notice."

About this time the doctor's equanimity was sorely disturbed by a most impudent literary imposture. Boswell gives us an account of it in his own characteristic style. "We got into a boat to cross over to Blackfriars ; and as we moved along the Thames, I talked to him of a little

volume, which altogether unknown to him, was advertised to be published in a few days, under the title of "Johnsoniana, or Bon Mots of Dr. Johnson." *Johnson*. "Sir, it is a mighty impudent thing." [It was a jest book, full of indecencies.] *Boswell*. "Pray, sir, could you have no redress if you were to prosecute a publisher for bringing out, under your name, what you never said, and ascribing to you dull stupid nonsense, or making you swear profanely, as many ignorant relators of your *Bon-mots* do?" *Johnson*. "No sir, there will always be some truth mixed with the falsehood, and how can it be ascertained how much is true and how much is false? Besides, Sir, what damages would a jury give me for having been represented as swearing?" *Boswell*. "I think, sir, you should at least disavow such a publication, because the world and posterity might with much plausible foundation say, 'Here is a volume which was publically advertised and came out in Dr. Johnson's own name, and by his silence, was admitted by him to be genuine?'" *Johnson*. "I shall give myself no trouble about the matter." The jest book had a large sale. The Reviewer truly says, "Among the inconveniences attending eminence of station, whether in place, dignity, or wit, those who rank in the latter class, are liable to one that is peculiar to themselves, and perhaps of all others, the most mortifying—that of having their names clapped to an abominable jest book."

Of the "Lives of the English Poets," we have a very favorable notice in the Review, for July 1779. "In the walk of biography and criticism, Dr. Johnson has long been without a rival. It is barely justice to acknowledge that he still maintains his superiority. The present work is no way inferior to the best of his very celebrated productions of the same class." There is a reproof, not undeserved perhaps, of the biographer's injustice to Milton. Nor did censure end with the Reviewer. In the next year appeared, "Remarks on Johnson's Life of Milton," in which pamphlet the war is carried into Africa, by charging Johnson with a connection with the wicked Lauder in his disreputable attempt to prove Milton a plagiarist: with which page of literary scandal some of our readers are doubtless acquainted, and those who are not, we have no time to enlighten. We shall briefly notice other Reviewers of our dogmatic Doctor's works. It must needs be that a severe censurer will elicit championship for the censured; and some of the gentlemen who took the critic to task were as little careful as himself to "seek acceptable



words." Of this number was the Rev. Donald McNicol, who conceived great umbrage at some of the remarks in the "Journey to the Hebrides." The "Monthly Reviewers," always ready either to berate or to defend Dr. Johnson, thus notice the "Minister of Lisinore's" strictures. In the present performance, our *young* Author hath attacked a most respectable veteran in literature, with much ill nature, and with a degree of petulance still more intolerable and disgusting than his acrimony. He hath anxiously sought for imperfections in a work where perfection was not attainable. He hath magnified errors and mistakes, which a candid mind would scarcely have perceived ; or if it had perceived, would readily have excused them. "What particularly provoked the worthy Scotch minister, was the following disparaging remark of the Doctor's : "Till the Union made the Scots acquainted with English manners, their tables were as coarse as the feasts of Eskimaux and their houses filthy as the cottages of Hottentots." Mr. McNicol remarks upon this : "In the name of wonder who could have expected such a remark to drop from the pen of a man on whom the witty Lord Chesterfield, many years ago, bestowed the appellation of *Antient* ! His Lordship was allowed not only to be a good judge of character, but likewise to have had a good hand at drawing a *likeness*. It was therefore unlucky in our Author to come blundering out with an expression which must call to our remembrance this striking specimen of the noble artist's skill. But I will be bold to affirm, that no man has ever yet seen Dr. Johnson in the act of *feeding*, or beheld the inside of his *cell* in *Fleet Street*, but would think the *feasts of Eskimaux*, or the *cottages of Hottentots*, injured by a comparison." This is all in very bad taste. Mr. McNicol !

The "Lives of The Poets," as might have been anticipated called forth much criticism : accordingly we have, "Cursory Examination of Dr. Johnson's Strictures on the Lyric performances of Gray," which is written with liberality and candor. (Monthly Review.) Another Reviewer favors the public with, "Observations on Dr. Johnson's Life of Hammond," the arguments of which are represented as "spirited, ingenious, and conclusive." Again we have "An inquiry into Some passages in Dr. Johnson's Lives of the Poets. Particularly his observations on Lyric Poetry, and the Odes of Gray. By R. Potter." The "Monthly Review" arraigns him for his "petulance, trespassing in more instances than one, upon good manners." There is no better proof of the execution

of the Doctor's artillery than the violent clamor thus excited, and relieving itself by the medium of these angry pamphlets. But one gentleman was disposed to strike home, and cause the Doctor to look to his own safety. The Monthly Reviewers thus speak of the "*Deformities of Dr. Johnson: Selected from his Works.*" Edinburgh printed. This seems to be the production of some ingenious but angry Scotchman, who has taken great pains to prove, what all the world knows, that there are many exceptionable passages in the writings of Dr. Johnson. There are, however, few spots in this literary luminary now pointed out, that have not been discovered before. So that the present map must be considered rather as a monument of the delineator's malignity, than of his wit. His *personalities* seem to indicate personal provocation; though, perhaps, it may be all pure *nationality*."

The course of this great man was now nearly run. In December of the next year, (1784) he was called to that rest which remaineth for those who cast themselves in humble confidence and with a true faith, upon that mercy which is the sinner's hope and the saint's dependence. We may not doubt that to him the exchange was a happy one. Error there had been in his life—for who is there among the children of men that hath not transgressed? But there was hearty repentance, deep contrition, and fervent faith. He had proved his faith, too by works of charity and deeds of love. He had been, literally, eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame. He had "strengthened him that was ready to perish," and he had "upholden the fallen." His bread had been "dealt to the hungry, and the poor and cast out he had brought to his house." The promise was fulfilled to him, as it hath ever been to those who rely upon its merciful assurance: "In the time of trouble" God remembered him, and freed him from that "bondage" which had so long held him in "fear of death;" he resigned his soul into the hands of his Creator with filial confidence and triumphant hope!

## ARTICLE VII.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*History of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy.* By John Foster Kirk. Vols. I. and II. Phil. J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1861. Nothing within the compass of modern literature has been published more

attractive, than the narrative contained in the volumes before us. It is one of absorbing interest. By many the career of Charles the Bold was, for a long time, considered only a romantic episode in the history of Europe, but recent researches have developed many facts in reference to this eventful period, as to present the scenes and the actors in a different light, from that which they formerly occupied. The author, although comparatively unknown, for a long time was associated with the illustrious Prescott, as his amanuensis and reader, who, in his "Philip the Second" generously acknowledges his indebtedness for the aid he received from him in the prosecution of his researches, both by his familiarity with the history and languages of modern Europe and his sagacious criticism. Gifted by nature, trained under the most favorable influences, with the power of patient investigation and that of vivid representation, loving his work and engaging in it with all the zest, so essential to success, Mr. Kirk seems peculiarly fitted for the work which he has undertaken. He always rises to the measure of his subject and, placing himself in genial sympathy with his characters, inspires his readers with something of the same enthusiasm. The style is simple yet rich, the narrative bold and striking, the facts are presented with great discrimination and skill. The work is an honor to the accomplished author, who is destined to take a prominent position among our American historians. An additional volume, now in course of preparation, will complete the history, the appearance of which will be anticipated by the public with deep interest.

*The Life and Times of John Huss; or the Bohemian Reformation of the Fifteenth Century*, By E. R. Gillet. In two Volumes. Boston Gould & Lincoln, 1863. We cordially welcome this important contribution to our ecclesiastical literature. The theme is one of thrilling interest and full of instruction. The character and influence of Huss, his earnestness of purpose, singleness of aim, his heroic faith and martyr death, as well as the deep interest, which attaches to that memorable struggle for truth and religious freedom, will attract attention to the work. Dr. Gillet has performed his difficult task with ability, judgment and literary taste. These volumes will take their place among standard works upon kindred subjects and reflect the highest honor upon the author and the country which produced him.

*Sermons preached before his Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales*, during his tour in the East, in the Spring of 1862, with notices of some of the localities visited. By A. P. Stanley, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. New York. Charles Scribner. 1863. The interest of these sermons is very much increased by the circumstances and occasion of their delivery. Dr. Stanley was the Chaplain of the Prince of Wales during his excursion through the East and the Holy Land, and on the Lord's Day usually delivered before him and his suite a brief discourse, suggested by the locality, in which they were tarrying on the way. These discourses are followed by copious and valuable sketches of the country and places, the Mosque of Hebron, the Samaritan Passover, Galilee, Hermon and Lebanon, Patmos, accompanied with maps and diagrams of the most interesting scenes visited. The volume is replete with information and abounds with excellent thought, practical and spiritual, expressed in clear and beautiful language.

*The Young Parson.* Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1863. This volum contains a series of incidents and sketches in the pa-toral experience of the writer, presented with remarkable fidelity and success, and indicating talent of a high order. There is a rich vein of genuine humor running through the work, whilst many of its scenes are described with great tenderness and pathos. It is a pleasant and profitable book and will everywhere find readers.

*Heaven.* By Rev. H. Harbaugh, D. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1863. *Heavenly Recognition.* By Rev. H. Harbaugh, D. D. Lindsay & Blakiston. 1863. *Heavenly Home.* By Rev. H. Harbaugh, D. D. Lindsay & Blakiston. 1863. These books have been before the public for some time and have been received with very great favor. They are now presented in a more attractive form, on tinted paper and in elegant binding, worthy of the high reputation which they have enjoyed. The subjects discussed are deeply interesting to all Christians, and serve to bring us nearer the realities of the eternal world. The author has, for many years, been specially interested in these studies and has gathered together a large amount of information respecting the different opinions, which have, from time to time, prevailed with regard to the future life. Without endorsing every sentiment, which the volumes contain, we think they are deserving of the high estimation in which they are held.

*The Greek Testament.* With a critically revised text: a digest of various readings: marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage: prolegomena: and a critical and exegetical commentary. For the use of Theological students and Ministers, By Henry Alford, D. D. In four Volumes. Vol I. containing the four Gospels. New York. Harper & Brothers, 1859. This work is well known and highly appreciated by the student of the Bible, that it needs no special recommendation. He who has been in the habit of consulting its pages, finds it difficult to dispense with the valuable help, which it furnishes. We are gratified with the prospect, presented of a speedy completion of the American edition.

*Memoir of the Life and Character of the late Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen, LL. D.* By Talbot W. Chambers, A minister of the Collegiate Church, New York. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863. This is an interesting and faithful portraiture of a great and good man who was long and favorably known to the American public and whose memory will ever be held in affectionate remembrance. Distinguished as an advocate, a statesman, as the presiding officer successively of two Literary Institutions, and the leader of several of our benevolent Societies, his influence was widely felt. In every position which he occupied, the purity of his personal character and the depth of his religious experience were most strikingly exhibited. His life is another illustration of what an intelligent, earnest Christian layman may accomplish, whose heart is unreservedly devoted to God. The narrative by Dr. Chambers is given, without any artistic effect, simply and naturally, and leaves upon the mind a truthful impression of the honored subject.

*The Family Bible:* containing the Old and New Testaments with brief notes and instructions, designed to give the results of critical investigation and to assist common readers to understand the meaning of the Holy Spirit in the inspired Word, including the references and marginal readings of the Polyglot Bible. Published by the American Tract Society. The object of these notes is to assist common readers to understand the teachings of God's Word by presenting simply and briefly the results of critical and judicious investigation. Appended to each

chapter are practical and instructive suggestions, calculated to awaken serious thought and impress the heart of the reader. We value the work most highly, and recommend it for use in the family and the school.

*Memorial of William Kirkland Bacon*, late Adjutant of the Twenty-Sixth Regiment of New York State Volunteers. By his Father. Utica, N. Y. Roberts. 1863. This is a beautiful and touching tribute to moral worth and devoted heroism, which no one can read without admiration. The father has executed his task in a spirit of earnest patriotism, Christian faith and humble resignation.

*Adjutant Stearns* Boston: Mass. S. S. Society. The subject of this interesting memorial was the son of President Stearns of Amherst College, a young man of rare promise. Influenced by a high sense of duty he relinquished his studies and gave himself to his country. This Christian hero and soldier fell in the sacred cause, near Newbern, N. C. The father has most delicately and affectingly sketched the noble character of his son.

*Notes on the Rebel Invasion of Maryland and Pennsylvania and the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1st, 2nd and 3rd, 1863.* Accompanied by an explanatory Map. By M. Jacobs, D. D., Professor of Mathematics and Chemistry in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. This is a minute, faithful and graphic account of the Battle of Gettysburg by one who was an eye-witness of most of the scenes which he describes and who is distinguished for his habits of accurate observation. The Chart, which accompanies the narrative, was made from actual measurements of the ground, and is of great value in reaching a proper comprehension of the positions of the two armies. The writer has rendered important service by the publication, which not only possesses a present interest but will furnish valuable materials to the future historian of the War.

*The Light and Dark of the Rebellion.* Phil. G. W. Childs. 1863. This is another contribution to the literature of the War and contains important material for the future historian. It is an instructive and entertaining book, and although the name of the author does not appear, he earnestly sustains the Government in its efforts to subdue treason and crush the Rebellion. The opinion is strongly maintained that Slavery, or the Union must die.

*The Life and Military Career of Thomas Jonathan Jackson, Lieutenant-General in the Confederate Army.* By Markinfield Addey. With a Portrait. New York: Charles T. Evans. 1863. We have in this volume a brief narrative of the prominent events in the life of this distinguished rebel General, and of the scenes, with which he was intimately associated in the history of the Great Rebellion. The author is impartial and shows a disposition, neither to magnify nor depreciate the merits of its popular hero. Jackson was a remarkable man. No one in the Southern Army has awakened more enthusiasm and inspired greater confidence. His death was a severe blow to the Rebellion.

*Rebellion Record, A Diary of American events.* Edited by Frank Moore. New York. G. P. Putnam. This important publication reaches us regularly and becomes increasingly valuable as the War is prolonged. The last number completes the sixth volume. With the plan of the work we have always been pleased. *The Companion to the Rebellion Record*, a supplementary volume, two numbers of which have been issued is illustrated with portraits and contains speeches, reports and other documents connected with the War.



## CONTENTS OF NO. LVIII.

---

Article.	Page
I. THE PATRIARCHS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH FROM HALLE,.....	159
II. INSTRUCTION IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE ACCORD- ING TO THE SYSTEM OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.—BY JOHN HENRY KURTZ, D. D., .....	190
By REV. EDWARD J. KOONS, A. M., Brooklyn, N. Y.	
III. PAUL, THE MISSIONARY APOSTLE, .....	198
By REV. M. OFFICER, A. M., Lancaster, Pa.	
IV. THE CHRIST OF HISTORY,.....	212
By H. S. DICKSON, D. D., Lewisburg, Pa.	
V. THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG,.....	225
By Prof. M. Jacobs, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.	
VI. THE CONFESSORS AND THE CONFESSION OF AUGS- BURG,.....	246
By REV. F. W. CONRAD, Chambersburg, Pa.	
VII. REVIVALS, .....	273
By PROF. L. STERNBERG, A. M., Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.	
VIII. INSPIRATION, .....	293
By CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.	
IX. LANGE'S THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL COM- MENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT, .....	298
By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.	
X. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....	301

The article of Rev. M. Loy, on the Ministerial Office, with which this number opens, is one of the very ablest, with which the Review has ever been graced. The points are clearly stated and well argued, and the fundamental positions in it are established on a basis which it seems to us almost impossible to shake. The next article by Dr. Stockton, on the Object of Life is a profound discussion, worthy of a Christian orator, of the true and false theories of life. The style, in the very affluence of thought and imagery, runs at times into the mystical. The third article is a translation from Sartorius by Rev G. A. Wenzel. Its theme is Sacramental Meditations on the Presence of the glorified Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Supper. It is a noble discussion, well rendered. The article of Rev. M. Valentine, on the Christian Doctrine of Fasting, is characteristically good, compressing into a narrow space the most essential principles and arguments, connected with a just view of the subject. Prof. Stoever contributes to his valuable series of Reminiscences one of William Carpenter and another of J. C. W. Yeager. The next article is on Dr. Johnson: his Works and his Reviewers, from the pen of Dr. Allibone. It is a rich article as might be anticipated when such a subject is in the hands of so accomplished, genial and skilful a writer as is the author of the Dictionary of English and American Literature. This number, which we regard as more than ordinarily excellent, closes with a number of just critiques on the most important new publications. Its appearance is very good and is rendered more cheerful by a change in the color of the cover. Prof. Stoever is indefatigable in his work as Editor, and deserves the warm gratitude and hearty support of the whole Church.—*Lutheran & Missionary.*

With praiseworthy promptness Prof. Stoever sends us the first number of his excellent Review for another year. As usual, it is rich with articles of interest to thoughtful minds.—*Congregationalist, (Boston.)*

*The Evangelical Quarterly Review* for January comes promptly to hand. All the Articles are able, but those by Drs. Stockton and Allibone will be to many specially interesting. We think the insertion of such sketches of deceased ministers, as those contained in this number, might profitably be introduced as a feature in other Reviews.—*The Evangelist (New York.)*

Professor Stoever adds to his valuable series of biographical sketches of Lutheran Ministers, one of William Carpenter and another of J. C. W. Yeager. The article by Dr. Allibone, the author of the Dictionary of English Literature, will attract the attention of literary men. It is worthy of the reputation of the author.—*The Methodist (N. York.)*

The January number of this Quarterly has been received. The number is an excellent one and commences a new volume.—*German Reformed Messenger.*

THE  
EVANGELICAL  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LVIII.

APRIL, 1864.

ARTICLE I.

THE PATRIARCHS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH FROM  
HALLE\*.

Your attention is invited to a consideration of the life and services of the men, who may be justly regarded as the founders of the Lutheran Church in this country, whose hearts animated with love, and whose hands, nerved with faith and mighty power, commenced the work here, when everything was yet to be accomplished, whose indefatigable and self-denying efforts, whose earnest and faithful life illustrated and defended the doctrines and duties of the Church, which they loved, and for whose advancement they labored and toiled.

At a very early period in the history of the American colonies there had been numerous settlements of Lutherans in different parts of our land, and some few of them had been provided with able and devoted ministers, but as a general thing, our Lutheran interests were sadly neglected. Fre-

\*Delivered by appointment of the Historical Society of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, at the meeting of the General Synod, in Lancaster, May 7th, 1862, and published by request.

quently those, who had assumed the sacred office, were of doubtful character, ignorant and destitute of piety or love for the work, self-constituted pastors, who ministered in sacred things with the same feelings and motives, with which individuals engage in some secular profession. "In those days, there was no king in Israel, but every man did that, which was right in his own eyes." Deprived of the advantages of a regular ministry, many of the aged became callous and indifferent in the service of their Master, and the young grew up, in ignorance and vice. The Lord's vineyard ran to waste and multitudes perished. Yet there were those who remained "stedfast and immoveable," who earnestly desired the watchful care of the faithful shepherd to direct their religious devotions in the manner, to which they had, from their childhood, been accustomed. In their destitution they naturally turned to their transatlantic brethren, whose sympathies and interest were not solicited in vain. In reply to repeated and importunate applications relief, at last, came from the Orphan House at Halle, at the time, under the superintendence of Prof. G. A. Francke, son of the immortal founder, who had rested from his labors in 1727, but whose fervid piety and active missionary spirit still pervaded the Institution and were reflected in the character of all, who emanated from its sacred halls. From this period (1742) the condition of our Church in this country gradually improved. It took a position and exerted an influence. It enjoyed the uninterrupted confidence and cordial regard of Christians of every name. Let us, this evening, with kind and grateful thoughts, gather around the graves of these *Patriarchal Fathers*, the venerable pioneers of Lutheranism in this Western world, whose memory the Church loves and reveres—not so much for the purpose of finding any new facts in reference to them, as to refresh our minds and our hearts with reminiscences of their eminent virtues and faithful services. They have all passed away. Their forms have faded from our sight; their voices have been hushed in our ecclesiastical councils, they rest from their labors and are now before the throne, among the "spirits of just men made perfect," in the eternal adoration of the living God. But their works do follow them. The train of events which they put in motion will never die. Even if their children should fail to "garnish their sepulchres," the impression they produced on the age, in which they lived, the moral power, which they

exerted during life, will be transmitted with unimpaired vigor and will continue to be felt till the end of time. The influence of character cannot be destroyed by death. *Virtut enim, vivetque semper.* It guides, restrains, silently but irresistibly impresses itself upon successive generations and, from year to year, achieves fresh conquests. The memory of the good cannot perish. It is in the grateful keeping of many hearts. It is held in everlasting remembrance. It lingers among us, after the sunset of the tomb, to shed light and to diffuse a rich fragrance among those who still survive.

Of this faithful band of Patriarchs comes first, *facile princeps*, HENRY MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG, around whose character and history the shadows of more than half a century have gathered, but who has left so many precious memorials of his honorable and useful career, as to secure immortality to his name, whose children's children\*—an inheritance which a good man leaves—are with us, this day, in the house of God, participating in the counsels and deliberations of that Church he labored to advance and whose posterity to the fourth generation,\* are adorning the ministry of reconciliation, to which the powers and services of his life were consecrated. This eminent servant of God, whose intellectual and moral qualifications, enlightened zeal and laborious efforts, have always been acknowledged by the Lutheran Church in this country, seems to have been specially trained and peculiarly fitted by Providence for the important and responsible work. Born of pious parentage, instructed in the doctrines and principles of the Christian religion, in early life he was received by the rite of confirmation into communion with the Church. Deprived in his youth of his paternal guardian he was thrown upon his own resources for a support, yet his leisure hours were faithfully devoted to the acquisition of knowledge, to the prosecution of his studies, or the work of instruction. It proved to him a period of preparatory discipline, in which were formed those habits of

\*F. A. Muhlenberg, M. D., Lancaster, Pa., son of Henry Ernest Muhlenberg, D. D. and grandson of the Patriarch; and H. H. Muhlenberg, M. D., Reading, Pa., son of Hon. H. A. Muhlenberg, and great grandson of the Patriarch. Both of them delegates to the Twentieth Convention of the General Synod.

†Rev. F. A. Muhlenberg, Professor in Pennsylvania College, and W. A. Muhlenberg, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Holy Communion, New York, both great-grandsons of the Patriarch.



self-reliance, of careful discrimination and systematic effort, that strength of purpose and vigor of character, for which he was subsequently distinguished, and which qualified him so fully for his particular mission in life. Although compelled to struggle with difficulties, he triumphed over every obstacle. He enjoyed the advantages of a regular and liberal education under the direction of the ablest teachers of his day, first at Göttingen, and afterwards at Halle, and laid the foundation of that ripe scholarship and extensive erudition which rendered him an honor to the Church and his name everywhere a praise. Whilst he was a student at Halle he was also employed as an instructor in the celebrated Orphan House, and, on the completion of his studies, served, for a brief period as Inspector of a similar institution at Great Hemmersdorf in Lusatia. Whilst he was occupying this position he was seriously considering whether it was not his duty to embark as a missionary to India, where in Bengal it had been determined to establish a mission under the auspices of the Lutheran Church, when the earnest application for a minister from congregations in Pennsylvania reached Halle. The attention of Dr. Francke is immediately directed to young Muhlenberg, then in his 31st year, as a most suitable individual for the field of labor. Cheerfully yielding to the call, and believing that he is following the leadings of Providence, he is ready to relinquish the endearments of his native land and the society of friends, as well as the prospects of future distinction, to which a mind so highly gifted, could naturally have aspired, and with unshaken confidence in God to settle in this remote, and, at that time, inhospitable region, as a humble instrument for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. He reached this country (Charleston, S. C.) in the autumn of 1742, and immediately proceeded to Ebenezer, Ga., for the purpose of consulting with his brethren in the faith, *Bekius* and *Gronau*, who had come hither in 1734, in company with a colony of Salzburgers, exiles from their native land, in consequence of the religious persecution and Romish intolerance, from which they suffered. His arrival in Philadelphia, a few months later, Nov. 25th, 1742, was an occasion of great joy and inexpressible gratitude to his German brethren, who had been so long anxiously expecting his advent. The Church he found in a most deplorable condition. Entering at once upon the discharge of his duties, he assumed the pastoral care of the associated churches of Philadelphia, New Hanover, Swamp and Prov-

idence, (Trappe,) which had united in a call for a minister. These three congregations continued to form the more prominent scenes of his ministerial labors, but he was also frequently engaged in Lancaster, Reading, Germantown, Tulpehocken and other points in Pennsylvania as well as in the States of New Jersey and New York, where he preached in German, English and Dutch. He, likewise, when the opportunity offered, assisted his Swedish brethren in the faith, whose colony in this country on the banks of the Delaware was planted as early as the year 1638. There was probably not an organized Lutheran Church in his day, in which he did not preach, and when any difficulty occurred in any congregation his aid was always invoked, and seldom did his presence fail in reconciling differences and restoring harmony. Often he undertook distant and irksome journeys for the purpose of gathering together the scattered flock, preaching the word and administering the sacraments to destitute congregations, introducing salutary discipline for the government of the churches and performing other kind services in his desire to repair the waste places of our Lutheran Zion and to promote the cause of genuine piety. From the beginning of his career until the close, all the powers of his mind and the energies of his body were devoted to the great object, which had brought him to this missionary work. Although his labors were so arduous they were performed with conscientious fidelity, with intense, untiring zeal and with the most efficient devotion, amid obstacles and exposures, trials and privations, at the present day, scarcely credible. Our own population was unsettled, ministerial support inadequate, and often in the discharge of duty violent opposition was experienced. Difficulties, the most formidable and discouraging, had to be encountered in planting the Lutheran Church in this country.

*Tante molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*

The first three years of his ministry in this country Dr. Muhlenberg resided in Philadelphia, the next sixteen, at Providence. In 1761 he returned to Philadelphia and remained fifteen years, the condition of things in the congregation there requiring his presence. In 1776 he resumed his charge in the country, a location more favorable to his health and the enjoyment of quiet and repose. But during the War of the American Revolution, because of his warm affection for his adopted land, he was subjected to many annoyances and

his life often exposed to the greatest peril. "The name of Muhlenberg," he writes, "is greatly disliked and abused by the British and Hessian officers in Philadelphia, and they threaten prison, tortures and death, so soon as they can lay hands upon me." He was warned and entreated to remove farther into the interior from the scene of hostilities, but he always refused. He sought, in humble prayer, protection under the shadow of the Almighty, and the God, in whom he trusted, his refuge and his fortress, delivered him from the snare, and guarded him from the evils, which so often seemed to impend. The last ten years of his life, his health gradually declined and the infirmities of age increased. During his protracted confinement, his patience under suffering was remarkable and his resignation to the will of his Heavenly Father, most delightful. No murmur escaped his lips. "His last years," says Dr. Helmuth, "were years of prayer. It was his constant employment." He was maturing for Heaven. His path was that of the just, shining more and more steadily and onward to the perfect day. His mind was calm and comfortable, sustained by a humble yet firm reliance upon the Saviour of sinners. He had no fear of death, although the hand of the Destroyer appeared often uplifted to strike him down, and when the summons came, with entire composure and in confident expectation of a blissful immortality through the merits of the Redeemer he yielded up his spirit and rested in the bosom of his God. His earthly career terminated Oct. 7th, 1787, at the Trappe, where his honored remains quietly repose and whither many a pilgrimage is still made by those who cherish the memory and revere the character of the good Patriarch. His death was the occasion of wide-spread, unaffected sorrow. The intelligence travelled over the land as a dark cloud, and brought profound grief to many a heart. He was the friend and father of all, and all regarded it as their privilege and duty to mourn.

When an individual, for so long a period, has endured the ordeal of careful scrutiny, has occupied the highest position and enjoyed the loftiest influence, has passed through the temptations, conflicts and trials, incident to this life, and come out unsullied, like gold tried in the fire, when the afflicted and the erring have gone to him all this time and found him a good and kind counsellor, when the Spirit of God has accompanied his ministrations most abundantly, so that through his efforts many souls were first attuned to the objects and joys of a higher life, when his brethren in the

ministry and the whole Church have looked up to him with an admiration and a love, a veneration and a confidence, seldom equalled, we may safely say, when such a one is removed, that "a great man has fallen in Israel." When he was taken away, all felt that an irreparable loss had been sustained, a chasm had been made, which could not easily be filled. The history of his life is the history of one of the noblest minds, consecrating its learning, its affections, its influence, its energies to all the highest interests of the Church and of humanity, to the glory and service of that Saviour, who has bought us all with his own precious blood.

Next to Muhlenberg, in 1745 came PETER BRUNNHOLTZ, accompanied by the catechists, Kurtz and Schaum. Their arrival was hailed with the greatest satisfaction. A German, approached the strangers, as they were leaving the vessel on their way to the city, not knowing who they were, and earnestly inquired, whether no evangelical preachers had come to supply their spiritual wants. An affirmative response to the inquiry was received with the most heartfelt gratitude. They were soon introduced to the brethren in Philadelphia and cordially welcomed to their new home. The intelligence was immediately conveyed by a special messenger to Dr. Muhlenberg who was, at the time, serving his charge in the country. His heart rejoiced, that his prayer had been heard and relief afforded.

Brunnholtz was a candidate of Theology, when Muhlenberg so earnestly sought for aid in his labors, and was, also, selected for the position by the Professors at Halle. He had been, for some time, connected with the University and possessed a practical acquaintance with the duties, which were to claim his attention, and to which he had dedicated his life, having already given proof of his gifts in preaching, and in his fidelity in the care of souls. On reaching this country, he was appointed second minister of the whole field of which Dr. Muhlenberg had assumed the care, Germantown having been added to the charge, and service being jointly performed in the four congregations by the two pastors. Subsequently the plan was modified, Muhlenberg occupying the more laborious ground, whilst Philadelphia and Germantown were assigned to Brunnholtz in consequence of his want of physical strength to attend to the duties, connected with a residence in the country. He lived in Philadelphia, and on the alternate Sabbath officiated in



Germantown. At a later period his efforts were confined to the congregation in the city, with which he remained connected till the close of his life in 1757, faithfully discharging the duties of his office and universally beloved, not only by the members of his own Church, but by the whole Christian community. Dr. M. in his correspondence with Halle, writes, "Our worthy colleague labors with all fidelity and patience. He speaks not in the words of human wisdom, but with the demonstration and power of the Spirit. His constant aim is the instruction and edification of his hearers. His intercourse with the people is profitable. He is most zealously devoted to their spiritual improvement. He visits the sick by day, and by night, if it is necessary, although he is himself in feeble health and of delicate constitution. He holds special meetings for prayer at his own house. He meditates, wrestles and prays in his closet for God's blessing upon all the congregations, and especially upon the flock, committed to his care, on the fathers of the Church and the followers of Jesus in Europe. He is much engaged in the religious instruction of the young. He also takes an interest in the temporal affairs of the Church and sees, that pecuniary affairs are properly managed, yet as regards his own maintenance he is easily satisfied. He wants merely a support and lives from hand to mouth. If there is a surplus he permits the poor to enjoy it. In all things he proves himself a disciple of God and a faithful overseer of the mysteries, committed to his keeping. His labors are not indeed without the Divine blessing—the preached Gospel becomes unto some the savor of life unto life." Whilst he was Pastor in Philadelphia, St. Michael's Church was built, the corner-stone of which was laid in 1743. The edifice was completed in 1748 and consecrated to the worship of the Triune God during the meeting of Synod.

Although his health was so frail, Mr. Brunnholtz was in the Providence of God permitted to labor for a period of thirteen years, at a time, too, when his services were so much required and so important a work was to be accomplished. His life, it was believed, on several different occasions, was spared in direct answer to fervent supplications, made on his behalf, at the mercy seat.

We have already stated that in company with Brunnholtz came Kartz and Schaum, in the capacity of catechists, with the expectation, although highly educated, of devoting for a season their attention to the business of teaching, and of



thus removing a serious impediment to the success of the Gospel. It was a part of our earlier system in all our congregations to connect with the minister the school-master, who was a man of culture and selected for his piety. Wherever there was a Church, it was the practice of our Fathers to plant a school. This was under the control of the Church and proved a valuable auxiliary in advancing its interests. Our pastors were all deeply concerned for the religious instruction of the young and to them they devoted a considerable portion of their time. This was a marked feature of their labors, and it is to be much regretted, that this characteristic of our Church is, at the present day, often so sadly disregarded, or performed with so much heartless indifference. If more attention were bestowed by the Church upon the rising generation, and they were more thoroughly instructed in the doctrines and duties of the Christian religion, they would find it more difficult, in subsequent life, to wander from the fold, and to identify themselves with the maxims and the practices of the world.

JOHN NICOLAS KURTZ, on his arrival in this country labored for two years at New Hanover, imparting instruction to the young during the week, and on the Lord's Day performing ministerial labor under the direction of Dr. Muhlenberg. In 1748 he was regularly ordained to the work of the ministry, at the first meeting of the Lutheran Synod, ever held in this country, and which was organized, at the suggestion of the Theological Faculty at Halle. His first regular pastoral charge was Tulpehocken, where he remained for twenty-four years, with the exception of one year, which was spent at Germantown. He, too, labored with great fidelity, exposed to suffering, perils and difficulties, of which it is not easy, at the present day, to form an adequate conception. The country was unimproved, an almost unbroken wilderness. There were no turnpike-roads, no bridges, no conveniences for travellers, the roads lay through dense forests, and in passing to his preaching places and in visiting the members of his charge, his life was often in imminent danger from the attack of the tomahawk or scalping-knife. His trust was, however, in God and he always escaped unharmed. The services of the sanctuary were frequently interrupted or conducted, even at the most serious risk of

life itself, as the ruthless and vindictive Indian lay in wait for victims. During the hours of public worship the officers of the Church stood at the doors, as armed sentinels, to prevent a surprise, and if necessary to protect minister and people from an unexpected assault. Whole families were, sometimes, massacred. In a communication to Dr. Muhlenberg he writes, "That on one day not less than seven members of the congregation were brought to the Church for interment, having been massacred the evening before by the Aborigines." Desirous of improving the solemn occasion to the spiritual good of his hearers, he postponed the funeral obsequies until the succeeding day, and permitted the mangled bodies to remain in the Church building, so that notice could be given and the congregation convene. In the year 1771 he was persuaded to remove to York, Pa., and to take care of our Lutheran interests, west of the Susquehanna. Here he continued to labor for the space of twenty years, rendering the Church and the cause of religion most important service, the influence of which is still felt in that whole section of country. Mr. Kurtz resided here at the time the American Congress sat in York, which had removed into the interior of the State in consequence of not feeling secure in Philadelphia from British invasion. Bishop White was at the time Chaplain and made his home with Mr. Kurtz's family. A division of the army was likewise stationed in York, quartered in part among the citizens, and others occupying tents, pitched in the vicinity. The affairs of our beloved country, at that time, presented a gloomy aspect; money was scarce, the means of prosecuting the war were limited, and the hearts of many began to fail. Mr. Kurtz's deep interest and cordial sympathy in the cause were manifested by the most earnest appeals to his congregation on behalf of the distressed and suffering. After preaching on the Sabbath he would invite his hearers to collect all the articles of apparel they could spare, such as coats, shoes and stockings, shirts and hats, bed clothes and other available material, and send them to his residence for distribution among the destitute soldiers. Our ministers, who lived during the Revolution were devoted patriots, always prepared to render service, according to their opportunity or ability, and because of their attachment to the principles involved, they were often the victims of bitter persecution.

In 1792 Mr. Kurtz retired from the active duties of the ministry, in consequence of the failure of his health, and removed to Baltimore, calmly waiting for the summons of his Master, and still occasionally filling the pulpit of his son. A serene and peaceful death in 1794 terminated his labors and his toils, and opened Heaven to his emancipated spirit. Mr. Kurtz's literary attainments, his spirituality, his zeal, his pulpit ability and pastoral efforts have given him a prominent position among the Patriarchal Fathers of the Church, the eminent men who in our early history are identified with the origin and progress of the Lutheran Church in this country. The venerable descendant\* of this Patriarch is with us this evening, and in the Providence of God presides over this large and influential Convention, just one hundred and seventeen years after the advent of his grandsire to these shores.

JOHN HELFRICH SCHAUM, a man of kindred spirit, the son of pious parents, highly educated and full of missionary zeal was also at Halle, enjoying the counsels, instructions and personal influence of Professor Francke when Dr. Muhlenberg's touching appeals for help reached the Institution. His heart was moved by what he heard, his sympathies became deeply enlisted, and he at once resolved to engage in the work, and to minister to the spiritual wants of his brethren in this distant land. On his arrival he commenced his duties as schoolmaster in Philadelphia, and occasionally preached, at different points, under the direction of Pastor Brunnholtz. At the second meeting of the Synod, held in Lancaster in 1749, he was permanently invested with the sacred office. He labored for a season in York and the record says, "Here he was faithful in his public and private instructions, and God's favor was not withheld from him. He enjoyed the sincere love and confidence of the congregation, committed to his pastoral care." In 1755 he received and accepted a call to Tobickon and other congregations in the vicinity. In 1759, we find him living at New Hanover and preaching at Oley, Pikeland and Upper Dublin, and likewise assisting Dr. Muhlenberg every four weeks at Providence. His life, too, was emphatically a life of severe and constant labor. Like all the pioneers of our Church he preached in season and out of season, in churches

\*B. Kurtz, D. D., LL. D., President of the Twentieth Convention of the General Synod.

and in private dwellings, in barns and in the open air, completely absorbed in the work, to which, he believed, he had been called, earnestly and indefatigably laboring for the amelioration and spiritual improvement of his countrymen.

"To them his heart, his love, his griefs were given."

He, however, generally maintained a cheerful, happy frame of mind and in the year 1778, on the anniversary of his arrival in this country, thirty-three years before, he peacefully fell asleep in Jesus, animated by a bright and joyful hope of the resurrection of the just. Traditional accounts of his great usefulness are still preserved, and his memory is affectionately cherished by the descendants of those, who once sat under his ministry.

JOHN FREDERICK HANDSCHUH was the fifth of our earlier ministers, commissioned and sent from Halle to labor among the German population, in obedience to the repeated and importunate applications for ministers. Dr. Francke thought, that he had found in young Handschuh the very man that was needed, adapted in every respect to the important work, a man of ardent piety and thorough scholarship, with some ministerial experience and a heart burning with love for souls, qualifications, which could not fail to make him eminently successful in this missionary field. On his arrival in 1748 he was kindly welcomed by Dr. Muhlenberg with the words: "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy." It was agreed that he should immediately take charge of the vacant congregation in Lancaster, where he labored for more than two years. Although the position was regarded as a difficult one, in consequence of the distractions that prevailed, when he took charge of it, occasioned by the injudicious course of his predecessor, "his ministrations," says Dr. Muhlenberg, "were successful and resulted in much good. God blessed the faithful efforts of his servant to the profit of many souls." The congregation increased and harmony among the members was, in a great measure, restored. Under his direction a flourishing school was established and sustained. In reference to which he himself writes, "Our school consists of English, Irish and Germans, Lutherans and Reformed, and so anxious are the people to have their children instructed, that it is impossible to receive all who apply for admission." He was deeply interested in the

youth of his congregation and to them he devoted a large share of his attention. He would often say that more could be done with the children than with the parents. He regarded with great favor Catechization, and in the execution of this part of his duties he was most faithful and efficient. He frequently had in attendance upon these exercises as many as seventy Catechumens. They came to him twice a week to be instructed, and "many blessings," he says, "attended these services, so that my heart is filled with hope and joy." In the course of events, however, Mr. Handschuh felt inclined to choose a companion, with whom to share the cares and sorrows of life. He was united in marriage to the daughter of one of the deacons in the Church, but the choice gave offence, and proved the source of disturbance in the congregation. His situation became uncomfortable and his influence impaired. He, therefore, tendered his resignation and for a season, served the congregations at Providence and New Hanover. But as his physical strength was not adequate to the labors of a country charge, the congregation at Germantown was committed to his personal care. He was the first Lutheran minister that permanently resided in that place. We find him laboring here with great fidelity and zeal, and, among other efforts claiming his attention, he is deeply interested in the spiritual condition of a poor African, and after careful instruction receives him into the communion of the Church. We also find him occasionally officiating in English. In his day there was none of the violent and unrelenting prejudice against conducting the services of the sanctuary in the language of the country, which subsequently sprang up and which introduced a policy, so suicidal to the interests of the Church, retarding its progress and almost occasioning its total ruin. Thousands abandoned their parental communion and sought a home among other Christian denominations, because their children did not understand the German, whilst many who remained, in consequence of their limited acquaintance with the language, lost all interest in the exercises and became careless in their attendance on the ministrations of the pulpit. The result was, that other Churches built on our material and gathered in a rich harvest.

In the year 1755 Mr. Handschuh received and accepted a call to Philadelphia, where he remained until his death, which occurred in 1764, in the 17th year of his residence in



this country. His end, too, was peaceful and triumphant. "For he was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, and much people was added unto the Lord." All who came in contact with him were attracted by his sincere, unaffected piety. Rev. Samuel Davies, of the Presbyterian Church, refers to his great candor and simplicity and adds, "How pleasing it is to see the religion of Jesus appear so undisguised in foreigners! I am so charmed with it, that I forget all national and religious differences, and my heart is intimately united to them."

In 1751 there arrived also from Halle, under the auspices and sanction of the Theological Faculty JOHN DIETRICH MATTHEIAS HEINTZELMAN and FREDERICK SCHULTZ, both selected, as the record states, "on account of their integrity and aptitude for the work." "The Lord's name be praised," says Muhlenberg as he received them, "for so graciously providing for us. It is a proof of the goodness and favor which He shows His people." Mr. Heintzelman became associated in labor with Pastor Brunnholtz in Philadelphia. His duties were onerous, but they were highly acceptable and faithfully discharged. He preached, catechised and performed other pastoral work, and, until another teacher could be procured, had charge of the congregational school, giving instruction to one hundred scholars, three hours every day. Dr. M. writes, "The congregation cherishes for Mr. H. a high regard. He is kept busily engaged, but he is to me a great comfort." His career on earth was, however, brief. He fell in the ripeness of his years, in the vigor of manhood with his armor on, and in the field of conflict. The best medical skill was employed, prayers, public and private, were offered for his recovery, but his work was accomplished; the decree had gone forth and the spirit left its tenement of clay to dwell in that "house, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." He died in 1756, in the 30th year of his age, uttering words of joyful trust in his Redeemer, words of assured hope in reference to the glorious future, and listening with the deepest interest to the children of the school, who were brought to his dying chamber for the purpose of chanting to him the songs of Zion. A large congregation assembled to pay their tribute of affection, on the occasion of his funeral and "the tears" it is said, "flowed copiously." All felt that a most serious loss had been experienced.

His associate, Mr. Schultz, became assistant minister to the Church at New Hanover and then, for a time, preached to the congregation at Goschenhoppin. He subsequently received and accepted a call to Nova Scotia, where there were numerous Lutherans collected, and whither Dr. Muhlenberg had frequently been invited to come and locate. He labored here with success till his death, which occurred in 1809.

The spiritual destitution in Pennsylvania still prevailed. It was wide-spread and appalling. Thousands of Germans were annually reaching the country, unsupplied with the means of grace and surrounded by the most deleterious influences. Besides, death had been making inroads upon the little band of devoted laborers. Brunnholtz and Heintzelman were both sleeping in the grave. It was necessary to repair the loss occasioned by their removal, and also to make provision for others who were stretching forth their hands and importunately begging for bread. The Macedonian cry for help was heard from all directions, but the laborers were still few to enter in and reap. As assistance could be expected only from Europe, Dr. Muldenberg, who mourned over the desolations that existed, again lost no time in renewing his efforts with the brethren in Halle. The application is again successful and in answer to the call, Voigt and Krug, *par nobili fratrum*, are found willing to "forsake country, kindred, friends and ease," that they may proclaim the glad tidings of redemption through Jesus Christ to those who were perishing. They came in 1764. At this period there were, just forty established congregations, found in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Virginia, in connexion with the Synod of Pennsylvania, organized sixteen years previously.

JOHN LEWIS VOIGT, who was for several years, a Preceptor and afterwards an Inspector in the Orphan House at Halle, had acquired a high reputation for success, before leaving his *Alma Mater*. After his arrival in this country, for some time he temporarily filled appointments at Germantown, Providence and New Hanover. In that day every clergyman, for a season, was required to cultivate the field which, in the judgment of Synod, stood most in need of pastoral services. The power, in the *interim* of Synod, was invested in the presiding officer. Mr. Voigt's first regular charge was Germantown and Barren-Hill. He was afterwards connected with the congregations at Providence and

New Hanover. He then removed to Vincent, still however retaining his connexion with the church at the Trappe, and also serving as Pastor of several other congregations. Here he died, in the year 1800, at an advanced age, enjoying, as a minister of the Gospel, the confidence and esteem of all who knew him. He survived Dr. Muhlenberg thirteen years, whose funeral discourse he preached from the words, "Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart."

JOHN<sup>N</sup> ANDREW KRUG was also highly educated and, for a time, held the position of Preceptor in the Orphan House at Halle. The first discourse he preached in this country was from the text, "To that man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit and trembleth at my word." Before he located permanently he spent some time with Dr. Muhlenberg and Mr. Handschuh, and aided them in their duties. His first regular charge was Reading. "He came to us," says the Church Book, "as a faithful teacher and served the congregation, seven years, in love and sincerity towards God and man." "When he resigned," it is added, "it was to the great grief of the many earnest lovers of his teachings, both in and out of Reading." It was thought, however, by the brethren most important, that attention should be given to our Lutheran interests in Frederick, Md., and as he was selected for the purpose, he cheerfully acquiesced in their judgment. He removed thither in 1771. He was then, in the prime of manhood, having just reached his 40th year and regarded by all, as "a man of ripe scholarship, a man of mind, of goodness and of piety." He soon won the confidence of the people. "The communion list," it is said, "swelled its numbers and many young persons were added to the Church by the rite of Confirmation." His influence was salutary, his efforts were blessed. On the 30th of October, 1796, just as he had attained his three score years, the hand of death was finally laid upon him and he passed calmly to his rest.

The tenth in the series of the Halle Patriarchs was CHRISTOPHER EMANUEL SCHULZE, who too had caught the spirit that prevailed at the University, and was filled with a strong desire to preach the Gospel to his brethren in this Western World. He landed here in 1765, and was immediately chosen as Vice-Rector of St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, of which Dr. Muhlenberg was, at the time, the

Senior. Mr. Schulze continued, for five years, in this sphere of labor with his colleague, in building up the interests of the Church in Philadelphia. During this period, in 1769, Zion's Church was dedicated to the Triune God. This edifice, in that day, was considered the most elegant church in the United States. This is the church, to which Congress in 1781, then in session in Philadelphia, repaired in a body to express their grateful acknowledgment to the Divine Being for the victory achieved and the peace secured in the surrender of Cornwallis, at Yorktown. Thence Mr. Schulze removed to Tulpehocken, where he labored for thirty-eight years. A letter, written to Halle in 1782, refers to him in the following words: "Mr. Schulze is now, for the second time, President of the Ministerium. Besides his principal congregation at Tulpehocken, he attends to several other smaller ones. It is almost impossible, on account of the multiplicity of his official duties, to be a single day at home with his large family, but notwithstanding he is yet active and vigorous, and is able to endure labor and fatigue. Every year he instructs a large number of young persons in the principles of the Christian religion and receives them into the Church." In the Spring of 1809 having nearly reached his three score years and ten, he laid aside his armor and finished his course. He ceased to live when he ceased to work. He fell in the fortress, with many seals of his ministry and gems in his crown of rejoicing. In the funeral discourse, pronounced over his grave by Rev. Dr. Lochman, we find the following testimony: "In fidelity, industry and zeal few have surpassed him. He labored faithfully and conscientiously for the good of his people. By day and by night, in cold and heat, in sunshine and in rain, he ministered to them without any complaint. Even when old age came upon him, he desired to devote his feeble powers to the service of the Lord. He might truly have said with the great Apostle of the Gentiles, 'In journeyings often, in perils of water, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides these things, that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.'" John Andrew Schulze who, for several

years, filled the Gubernatorial chair of Pennsylvania, was his son.

Four years after the arrival of Schelze, in 1769 came JUSTUS HENRY CHRISTIAN HELMUTH and JOHN FREDERICK SCHMIDT, both of them young men, trained at Halle and employed for some time as instructors in their *Alma Mater*. Soon after his arrival Helmuth was elected Pastor of the Lutheran Church in Lancaster, where he labored with great acceptance and success for ten years. In 1779 he relinquished the charge, having received a unanimous call to Philadelphia. Here he spent the remainder of his life. His pastoral relations to the Church were continued till 1820, when the failure of his physical strength rendered it necessary for him to retire from the active duties of the ministry. He died in 1825 in the 80th year of his age.

Dr. Helmuth was a man of acknowledged abilities, and in the pulpit possessed more than ordinary power. He always preached with surprising unction, with great fervor and pathos. He was able not merely to hold an audience subdued under the charm of his eloquence, but at times to electrify them. The minds of those, who heard him, could not wander. They were chained. Their feelings seemed to be completely under the control of the speaker. His commanding, impassioned manner gave to his words a power, which was felt by all, an effect, which was truly astonishing. There are many incidents preserved, indicating the deep impression he produced, the permanent influence he exerted. For eighteen years he held the appointment of Professor of German and the Oriental languages in the University of Pennsylvania. In 1785 he, with his colleague, established a Seminary for the instruction of candidates in preparation for the sacred office—a work, in which he was engaged for twenty years. As early as 1804, there was a most flourishing Sunday School in connexion with his Church, numbering two hundred scholars and forty teachers. He was very much devoted to his pastoral duties. Especially does he deserve praise for his faithful labors, during the terrible ravages of the yellow fever, which spread its deadly contagion over Philadelphia in 1793 and 1800, and swept away thousands of its inhabitants. Although most of the city pastors fled from the devouring pestilence, Dr. Helmuth remained with his flock at the imminent risk of life. Inspired with a courage, which faith alone gives, he looked death in the face. Like an angel of mercy he went to the



house of mourning; he visited the sick, bent over the dying and imparted the consolations of the Gospel. Hundreds of his members fell victims to the terrific epidemic and six hundred and twenty-five of these he buried. On one occasion from the pulpit he remarked, "Look upon me as a dead man," and then, in the spirit of his Master, he departed to the abode of suffering and distress. His people found in him a devoted friend. He sympathized with the afflicted, he ministered to their comfort, he brought to all the relief in his power.

"Needy, poor,  
And dying men, like music, heard his feet,  
Approach their beds; and guilty wretches took  
New hope, and in his prayers wept and smiled,  
And blessed him, as they died forgiven."

He "counted not his life dear unto himself, so that he might finish his course with joy and the ministry, which he had received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God."

Schmidt, the companion of Helmuth, would, perhaps, never have abandoned his native land, had it not been for his devoted, enthusiastic, almost romantic attachment to his friend, *disidium sua anima*, separation from whom seemed insupportable. This affection continued unabated and unbroken through life, and terminated only in death. When the friend, whom he so tenderly loved, determined to embark in this missionary enterprise, there was no other alternative presented than to accompany him on his errand. His first charge on reaching this country was Germantown. This congregation he served sixteen years. He was their Pastor, during the Revolutionary War, and in consequence of his patriotic sentiments, his strong attachment to his adopted country, he was obliged to flee, whilst the enemy were in possession of the town. He resumed his duties and gathered together his dispersed flock, so soon as it was thought his life was no longer in peril. In 1785, he removed to Philadelphia, and became associated with Dr. Helmuth. This position he held until his death, "faithfully discharging," in the language of his bereaved colleague, "his duties, and enjoying the respect and confidence of all." He died, in 1812, Dr. Helmuth delivering on the occasion a most touching address from the words, "I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been to me.

thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women." Mr. Schmidt is described, in the *Halle Annals*, as "a plain and pious preacher, whose constant aim it was to lead the impenitent to God and to present before his hearers Jesus Christ and Him crucified." He was considered by all who knew him as a sincere and upright Christian, fearing God and eschewing evil, laboring systematically and with unwearied patience for the good of souls, proclaiming the truth, not only by precept but in his untarnished life. He was also a man of clear, acute intellect, a profound, original thinker, and a scholar of varied and extensive acquirements. He was distinguished as a mathematician and for his investigations in natural and philosophical science; he had also made considerable progress in the study of the Hebrew, Syriac and Arabic, and in the accuracy of his historical researches, particularly in the department of ecclesiastical history, had scarcely a superior. Yet with all his attainments he was exceedingly modest, never making any display of his knowledge, but always retiring and unassuming in his deportment to others. The Church may, with becoming pride, point to him, also, as one of her jewels.

We have now reached the last, but not the least, of the Patriarchs of our Church, educated at Halle and sent to this country under the auspices of those noble men, who presided over that celebrated school. JOHN CHRISTOPHER KUNZE came in 1779, and at once entered upon his duties as associate Pastor of the German churches in Philadelphia. This field of labor he occupied for fourteen years, universally beloved and exercising a wide influence for good, when he was transferred to the city of New York. Here he labored for twenty-three years, until his death in 1807. Dr. Kunze was the first of our ministers who introduced the regular use of the English language into the services of the sanctuary and sustained the liberal policy recommended, at an earlier period, by Dr. Muhlenberg. He fearlessly advocated the measure, and labored with untiring effort to promote it by every means in his power. As a preacher he took a very high rank. Although his voice was feeble, he was often quite eloquent in the pulpit. His sermons were very instructive, generally of a didactic character and marked by the fidelity, with which the cardinal truths of our holy religion were discussed. He was a man of great learning, systematic in his habits, and rather severe in his application. His Library was very extensive and valuable, perhaps the

most ample, possessed at the time, by any clergyman in this country. He was regarded by his cotemporaries as one of the best Theologians the country afforded, and was particularly distinguished for his acquaintance with Oriental literature. With signal ability he filled, for a long period, the Professorship of Oriental Literature in Columbia College, and during his residence in Philadelphia occupied a similar position in the University of Pennsylvania. So high was his reputation as a Hebraistic scholar that the Rabbis, connected with the Jewish synagogues, often resorted to him for assistance, when they encountered difficulties in the study of the Hebrew, and young men, in the prosecution of their studies with ministers of other denominations, placed themselves under his instruction in this branch of knowledge. He usually had some students with him in their preparation for the Christian ministry, and his instructions were often conveyed in the Latin language. Rev. Dr. Mayer, one of his pupils, in his discourse, commemorative of his fiftieth anniversary, as Pastor of St. John's Church, Philadelphia, remarks: "It was my happiness to be placed under the care of a teacher, more thoroughly qualified than any other, I have known, by extensive erudition and unwearied industry for directing the researches of students in Divinity." The late Dr. Miller, of the Presbyterian Church, after acknowledging his indebtedness to Dr. Kunze for much important information, contained in his work on the *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, adds, "The various acquirements of this gentleman, particularly his Oriental learning, has long rendered him an ornament of the American Republic of Letters. He has probably done more than any individual, now living, to promote a taste for Hebrew literature among those who are intended for the clerical profession in the United States. He is entitled to the character of a benefactor of the American churches."

We might have included in our list of the Halle Fathers the three sons of Dr. Muhlenberg, who repaired to Halle for the purpose of completing their studies for the ministry, but as they were native born Americans, we have confined our discussion to the thirteen men, who came over from Halle expressly as missionaries, pioneers of Lutheranism in this land, and who gave shape and character to our Church in this country. Dr. Mahlenberg's three sons all became distinguished. Two of them labored in the ministry only for a season, and subsequently, at a most critical period in

the history of our country, occupied important positions, in the State and the Army. The third, *Henry Ernest*, continued in the sacred work, until the close of his long and useful life, and was for thirty-five years, the honored pastor of this congregation.\* His memory is still enshrined in the hearts of many, who now hear me, his virtues and his services will ever be gratefully remembered by the Church.

An interval of twenty-eight years elapsed between the arrival of the first of these Patriarchal Fathers from Halle, Dr. Muhlenberg, in 1742, and the last, Dr. Kunze, in 1770. The first of the little band, Mr. Heintzelman, died in 1756, and the last, Dr. Helmuth, in 1825, embracing a period of sixty-nine years. The time intervening between the arrival of the first and the death of the last is eighty-three years. Thirty-seven years have past since the last of the number was taken from the toils of earth to the rewards of Heaven, from the Church militant to the Church triumphant. "Your fathers, where are they? and the prophets do they live forever?"

There were other men in our ministry, cotemporary with these Patriarchs, good and excellent men, who faithfully co-operated with them and rendered valuable service, but to the agency of these Halle missionaries are we principally indebted, under God, for the origin and early growth of the Lutheran Church in this Western hemisphere. The Church should cherish their virtues with grateful affection and hold their names in profound regard. Their Christian heroism, their earnest devotion to the principles they professed, their laborious efforts will not suffer in comparison with the founders of any branch of the Christian Church in this land. They possessed the confidence and esteem of all, with whom they were associated. They were never found wanting in any emergency. We have reason to rejoice in our ecclesiastical ancestry, although we may feel deeply humbled, that we have so inadequately fulfilled our mission, and realized so faintly our high responsibilities. We present to you, this evening, these Halle Patriarchs, who erected the standard of Lutheranism in this distant land, as model ministers of the Gospel, while we direct your attention to their prominent characteristics. The qualities, so essential to efficiency and success in the ministry of reconciliation, which charac-

\*Holy Trinity Church, Lancaster, Pa.

terized one, were generally found, in a greater or less degree, in all these devoted, faithful missionaries of the Cross.

1. They were all men of sincere, practical piety, earnest, active Christians, renewed by the Holy Ghost, completely brought under the sanctifying power of Divine truth and beautifully exemplifying, in their life, the strength of their principles and the influence of the Gospel. No one ever questioned their integrity. They were far above suspicion. All who knew them were impressed with the conviction, that they were good men, scrupulously conscientious, honest in their purposes and resolute in their maintenance. Their consistent, unsullied life gave a lustre and a value to their teachings, which secured the respect and attracted the admiration of the people. Their piety seemed deeply rooted in the heart, not swayed by impulse and fluctuating, but uniform; not simply a name but a reality, a fixed principle, which became incorporated with their nature, exercised a controlling agency over their conduct and was the vital element, in which they "lived, moved and had their being." It breathed in their spirit, spake in their words and acted in their life. They were all, so far as we have been able to ascertain, trained under the influence and guidance of pious parents, in the fear of God and, in their youth, imbued with deep, devotional feeling and high-toned Christian principle. The religious instructions and counsels, which they, at this period, received, together with the fervent prayers with which they were accompanied, produced an abiding, indelible impression upon their minds. They were not without the Divine blessing. The seed sown yielded its appropriate fruit. Their views on the subject of religion were evangelical and clear. They received the Scriptures as a Divine revelation and cordially embraced all the peculiarities of the Christian system. They were pervaded with an unbroken sense of the presence of God and the comparative worthlessness of every object, which might lead to the forfeiture of the Divine favor. They were men of strong faith, simple, childlike faith, so characteristic of the sincere, pious German. They constantly acted as if they believed the promises of God, and it was this, that inspired them with intrepidity in danger, fortitude in trial and patience in suffering. They were men of prayer, recognizing God in all their ways, realizing their dependence upon Him for success, and looking, at all times, for his blessing upon their labors. It



is said of Dr. Muhlenberg that, on occasions of perplexity, or when difficulties existed in any of the congregations, and the care of the churches pressed upon him, he often with tears spent whole nights in earnest supplication at the mercy seat. They all believed, that in direct answer to prayer, God had frequently interposed, and rescued them from impending evil. They all died in the faith, happy in the prospect of death, full of filial trust in the Saviour, in the peaceful, glorious anticipations of that eternal rest, "which remaineth to the people of God." Discipline, learning, power of thought and force of expression are all important to be employed in the service of the Church, but purity of heart, a spiritual apprehension of the truth, aspirations for holiness, the love of Christ shed abroad in the heart, as the governing principle of action, are still more valuable; and in this respect we claim for the Halle Patriarchs a high position, a pre-eminent distinction.

2. These men had a passion for the work, in which they were engaged, an ardent enthusiastic love for its duties. This appreciation of the service was so strong and positive, that no difficulties could discourage, no obstacles intimidate, no object, however alluring, divert them from their favorite pursuit. It was such a passion, as springs from the constraining love of God in the heart, as manifests itself in a tender regard for the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, a sincere desire to advance the highest welfare of their fellow-men in the salvation of the soul, and to promote the glory of God. They had drunk deeply of the spirit of Christ, their life was sustained by intimate, constant communion with Him, and they felt that no work, no employment on earth, was so full of satisfactory, pure and elevated enjoyment as that of bringing individuals to a saving acquaintance with the truth as it is in Jesus, of conducting them to the realms of eternal bliss. It was this same passion, stronger than death itself, which influenced them to leave their native land, to forsake home and friends, to renounce the prospects of honor and emolument and to engage in missionary labors in this distant and, at that time, dreary region. It was this love for the work, that led them cheerfully to submit to laborious toil to practice the greatest self-denial, to encounter opposition, patiently to meet persecution and even to die in the cause, which they had espoused, that their mission might be accomplished, "the wilderness and the solitary place be glad for them, and the desert rejoice and blossom, as the

rose." They were men of one idea. It was the burden of their heart, and the purpose of their life to honor their Master in achieving conquests over sin, and in extending the triumphs of the cross. To this every other object was made subsidiary. With it no other aims were permitted to interfere, no other plans to interpose. They gave themselves up wholly to the work. Their energies, their talents, their influence, their hearts, their all, were devoted unreservedly to the great object, to which they had consecrated their lives.

3. These Patriarchs were not only eminently pious and enthusiastically devoted to their work, but they were also model men in the performance of the duties, which they had assumed, to which they believed, in the Providence of God, they had been called. Active, zealous and faithful, few have surpassed them in their efforts, in the watchful care they exercised over the flock, in the defense of the truth, the maintenance of Christian principle, and the advancement of every good and noble work in the community. They were indefatigable in their labors, instant in season and out of season, abundant in their endeavors to promote the Divine honor and the spiritual improvement of all conditions and classes. In the pulpit they were always instructive and impressive. They never uttered sentiments, unworthy of their high and lofty vocation. The truths of God's word were presented with amazing simplicity and power, in such a manner, that the simplest could understand, and the wisest be instructed. They appeared to realize the responsibilities and obligations of their position, to feel sensibly, that to them the most momentous, solemn interests were intrusted, and this great object was always to be kept distinctly and prominently in view. Hence every topic was carefully excluded from the pulpit, which had not a direct bearing upon the great design, for which it was instituted. The whole counsel of God was fearlessly declared, and the simple doctrines of the cross unceasingly and faithfully preached. They never faltered in their work of faith and labors of love. They went about doing good in the name of the Lord. Their ministrations were often extended over large districts and their congregations were numerous, yet they were never charged with remissness or neglect of duty. In visiting the sick, sympathizing with the afflicted, comforting the bereaved, and counselling the wayward, they were all that men could be. They were ever ready to give the paternal, appropriate expression of kindness,

the word "fitly spoken;" ever anxious to reclaim the erring, to raise the fallen, to encourage the desponding and alleviate the suffering. They were deeply interested in the young. They regarded them with the most tender, the most affectionate concern, and most earnestly labored for their good, temporal and spiritual. They conciliated them by their gentle, winning manners, and acquired over them an unbounded, most salutary influence. It was to them a great pleasure to instruct the young in the principles of Christianity, to make them acquainted with the doctrines and duties of the Church, and to bring them in the morning of life under its restraining, guiding influence. They seemed to lay themselves out for the most thorough and systematic instruction in the Catechism, a time-honored usage in our Church, and one of the best methods for impressing evangelical truth on the heart. In this department of their labors they acquired very great skill, and their efforts were accompanied with the most beneficial results. Early trained to habits of the most rigid discipline, conscientious in the discharge of every duty, they seemed to possess an energetic strength, which specially fitted them for their arduous, difficult position. At all times and in every place, they ceased not to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ, presenting to all, with whom they were brought into any relation, a most beautiful picture of Apostolic zeal and love.

4. These Fathers were men of enlarged, catholic spirit, of liberal, comprehensive views. They were, it is true, firmly attached to their own communion; they loved its songs of praise, its fervid prayers, its venerable associations, its distinctive peculiarities. They unequivocally and cordially embraced its doctrines, believing, as they did, that they were in perfect harmony with the word of God. They acknowledged and revered the Symbols of the Church, for all our earlier churches in this country were built on the unaltered Augsburg Confession. But, although they loved their own Church, in which they had been born and reared, in which they labored, and to whose interests they were so warmly devoted, they were filled with the spirit of Christian love. They were no partisans. They had none of that sectarian, proscriptive disposition, or narrow, intolerant temper, which is inclined to exclude from its sympathies everything, which does not originate with itself and sees no good in that, which is not conceived or carried on, under its own auspices. They embraced

in the common faith Christians of all evangelical denominations and dwelt by the side of their ministerial brethren, whom they most highly esteemed, as the servants of Christ, in uninterrupted confidence and friendship. The intercourse and expression of their whole life was, refuge, mercy and peace be upon all them, who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth." Their motto was the sentiment of the great Christian Theologian, *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*. Forgetting minor differences and attending faithfully to the particular work, which Providence had assigned them, they labored for the things that make for peace, whereby one may edify another. In every respect for the general welfare, for the amelioration of the race and the diffusion of human happiness, they were always willing to co-operate, ever ready to give a helping hand. They rejoiced in the prosperity of Zion, in the lengthening of her cords and the strengthening of her stakes, in the accomplishment of good, no matter through whose agency, or under whose auspices, that good was accomplished. The record, which is preserved, of their relations and intercourse with brethren of other creeds is exceedingly interesting and touching. Dr. Muhlenberg, in one of his letters, speaks of a visit made him by Rev. Mr. Tennant, of the Presbyterian Church, as a season of spiritual refreshment. He also, attended, by particular invitation, a Convention of the Episcopal Church and met with a most cordial reception. In 1793, Drs. Findley and Tennant of the Presbyterian Church, Drs. Durkee, Peters and Egles of the Episcopal Church and Rev. Mr. Whitfield were present at a Synodical meeting of the Lutheran Church and, by a vote of Synod, Whitfield preached a sermon. Rev. Mr. Handschuh, also, in referring to a visit he had received from Mr. Tennant, remarks, "He is one, whom I love very much. Our conversations were pleasant, affectionate and profitable." These Patriarchs of the Church seemed to have an utter repugnance to mere disputation and unprofitable controversy among the friends of the Redeemer. Anything discussed, in tending to some good purpose, we suppose, they would not have declined; but they were far from indulging in a spirit of strife or animosity. At the present day, when we see Christians, who ought to be blessing in harmony for the spread of the Gospel, arrayed in open, bitter opposition to one another, or contending in reference to some slight difference, some point that is of no essential importance, when vital interests are



suffering and the cause of the Redeemer languishing, how often are we led to exclaim, *Totentur animis celestibus ira!* Will the time not speedily come, when "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim," but when all the tribes of Israel shall combine in one great effort against the common foe and gloriously triumph under the one great Leader, the Captain of our salvation?

5. These worthies of our Church were model men in the kind and fraternal spirit, which always characterized their intercourse, with one another. No one can read their correspondence or become acquainted with the state of things that existed among them without being deeply and most favorably impressed with their friendly relations, the strong attachment, the generous forbearance, the tender and affectionate interest, the glow of kindly feeling that constantly prevailed and diffused a Christian charm over their intercourse. Their communications reveal an expansive nobility and a warmth of heart, fitted to disarm prejudice, inspire confidence and win regard. There is exhibited an elevation, far removed from the ordinary selfishness of human nature, which, it is most refreshing, to behold. We find, in their intercourse, nothing harsh or censorious, no trace of malignity or bitterness, no vituperation or menace, derogatory to their Christian character, no hurried impulses, no sharp, oracular dogmatism, no cold indifference. They could not have perpetrated a mean or rude thing. Duplicity and indirect dealing they held in utter detestation. They were men of great courtesy, kindness and Christian amenity. They were considerate and tender of the feelings of others, generous and disposed to forget their own personal comfort, that they might minister to that of others, and promote the interests of those, with whom they were associated, beautifully exemplifying the Apostolic precept, "In honor preferring one another." They possessed delicate sensibilities and active sympathies; they knew how to "rejoice with them that rejoice and to weep with them that weep." This spirit of fraternal kindness is seen in the youngest and the eldest of these Christian brethren. Muldenberg, whose life furnishes so many illustrations of the meekness, the gentleness, the disposition of the Gospel, relinquishes his city charge to give place to a brother, in delicate health, who could not endure the fatigue and labor of country life, and we see others, in a spirit of self-sacrifice, exchanging a more



pleasant field of usefulness, in which they were successfully laboring, for an arduous and distant position, because in the judgment of the brethren the ground required cultivation. They seemed to be of one heart and of one mind. One aim, one desire, one object influenced all. That, which was regarded as the interest of one, was the interest of all. There was no disposition to take advantage of a brother, no misinterpreting of his actions, no impugning of his motives, no disparagement of his labors; there were no personal conflicts, no acrimonious dissensions. They were jealous of each other's reputation, and assiduously guarded it from any wanton or ruthless attack. They labored unitedly and successfully in building up the Church of their love, and in multiplying the trophies of redeeming grace. Is not this characteristic of our Halle Fathers, deserving of all praise, and worthy of imitation? Animated by the same spirit, stamped by the same superscription and image, even that of our Divine Master, shall we not dwell together in love, "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace?" Forgetting any slight differences and renouncing all personal considerations, may we not labor together harmoniously, as one man, in cultivating the important interests, specially committed to our keeping, and fulfil the high mission, assigned by Providence to the Lutheran Church in this country?

6. The Halle Patriarchs were men of enlarged intellectual culture. Their minds were thoroughly disciplined and filled with appropriate knowledge. In their youth, enjoying advantages, the most favorable for mental improvement, they had carefully prepared themselves for the solemn and responsible work of the Christian ministry. They did not enter upon their duties *per se*, without the necessary intellectual furniture. Hands were not suddenly laid upon them. They had been subjected to the most rigid, systematic training, to years of patient, toilsome, laborious effort. They had passed through a long, probationary term. They had satisfactorily sustained the various processes of careful examination. They were weighed in the balances, and not found wanting. They were approved workmen, such as need not be ashamed, scribes well instructed in the mysteries of the kingdom, thoroughly qualified for their duties, prepared to grapple with difficulties and to expose error, in whatever form or aspect it might be presented. They did not feel embarrassed at every step in their pro-

gress for the want of the requisite knowledge. They never offended against correct taste, or brought their office into disrepute or degradation by their ignorance or failure. They were powerful champions of the truth. They challenged the respect and awakened the confidence of all around them. Their contemporaries placed a very high estimate upon their intellectual worth. Their society was sought, their influence courted, their abilities were appreciated by the learned of the day. Several of them were honored with the Doctorate and other meritorious titles, at a time, when those distinctions were rare, and only conferred upon the individual, whose claims to the eminence were acknowledged and undisputed. Two of them were called to Professorships in leading literary institutions of the land, others were specially invited to be present at the *Annual Commencements* of some of our Colleges and participate in their examinations, whilst several of them served as Trustees in the most prominent Schools of the land. We do not discover, that their piety was less active, or their efforts to do good less efficient, because of their profound erudition and their varied attainments. These contributed largely to the astonishing results they achieved. Their learning was made tributary to the great work, to which they had devoted themselves, and imparted dignity and value to ministerial action. Their power to do good was greatly increased. Whilst they were thus better able to contend with sophistry, dissipate doubts and defend the faith, their instructions to the simple and ignorant were rendered more operative and successful. The Sacred Scriptures have no where taught us to disregard the appropriate means, prescribed for the accomplishment of the proper end, because "the excellence of the power may be of God, and not of us." Mere piety, uneducated, will not do, just as education without piety will fail of the desired result. Whilst we unhesitatingly admit, that the Spirit of God in the heart is the first and indispensable qualification of the Gospel ministry, we are free to say, that the influence and usefulness of any Church will be in proportion to the ability and learning, accompanied, of course, with ardent piety, of those who minister at her altars.

These are the men, then, whose memory we love to revere, whose virtues the Church desires to transmit to posterity, to whom we can point, as our founders, and inquire, without the fear of successful contradiction, whether they were surpassed, in intellectual or moral worth, by any of

their cotemporaries, their brethren connected with other branches of the Christian Church, who are so frequently held up, and, no doubt, with sufficient reason, for our admiration and esteem. We do not say they were immaculate. They made no pretension to infallibility; they laid no claim to exemption from the common defects and frailties of human nature. The mists of passion may, sometimes, have obscured their judgment and led to the commission of mistakes. They would, no doubt, have charged themselves with faults, which these, who knew them best, would never have imputed to them.

*"Nam vitiis nemo sine nascitur; optimus ille est  
Qui minimis urgetur."*

They were, however, free from many of the infirmities and foibles, which so frequently cling, even to good men and impair their influence for good. Scarcely do we meet with a band of men, so deserving of confidence, so entitled to commendation, so worthy of preservation in the hearts of the Church as these Halle Patriarchs, whose character and services we have endeavored, this evening, to delineate.

Let us, in conclusion, believe, that if God so kindly smiled upon our Church in the beginning, vouchsafed to it his protection, and so abundantly blessed the labors of our Fathers amid the obstacles, which environed their path, He will not withhold his gracious presence and favor in the future, if we are only faithful to our obligations. Let us raise our Ebenezer, and say, "Hitherto the Lord hath helped us." Let us look for his continued blessing. His eye beholds, his hand sustains, his Spirit guides, his Providence protects, his grace preserves us to this day. Let us implore the Great Head of the Church to establish us in abiding peace and prosperity, and pray the Lord of the harvest to raise up continually faithful ministers of the Gospel, endowed with gifts and graces, who shall honor their profession and bless the world, who, when dead, may yet speak in the life and labors of those, who survive them. Commending ourselves to God and to the Word of his grace, "who is able to keep us from falling" and "to give us an inheritance among all them that are sanctified," let us gird up our loins and adopt, each one for himself, the Master's maxim, "I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day, for the night cometh, when no man can work."

Happy shall we be if we have not lived in vain, if through our instrumentality other men have been made better, triumphs, gained over sin and guilt, sorrow and suffering relieved, the dark clouds, which hang over human existence, scattered, and the pure and benign principles of our holy religion extended! "*The Lord our God be with us, as he was with our fathers; let him not leave us, nor forsake us: that he may incline our hearts unto him, to walk in all his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgments which he commanded our fathers!*"

## ARTICLE II.

INSTRUCTION IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE ACCORDING TO  
THE SYSTEM OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH  
—BY JOHN HENRY KURTZ, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THE  
UNIVERSITY OF DORPAT.—TRANSLATED FROM THE  
SIXTH GERMAN EDITION.

By REV. EDWARD J. KOONS, A. M., Brooklyn, N. Y.

### INTRODUCTION.

#### §1. Religion.

THE essence of religion consists in the fellowship of man with God. The design of this fellowship is, that man may share in the holiness, happiness and glory of God. Man is created for this fellowship. For him it is intended. A mighty voice from the aspirations and longings in his heart, makes this evident. For it finds no true rest nor peace, until it is assured of fellowship with God. This same voice, however, also shows that man is no longer in his original fellowship with God, and a searching glance very soon sees, in his sinfulness, the ground and reason of this separation. The idea of religion, according to this, may be more accurately expressed as, *the restoration of that fellowship with God, which was disturbed by sin.*

#### §2. True and False Religion.

Every religion, which desires, but is unable to reach and produce this restoration, because the right means and

method is wanting, is a false one. The true and perfect religion is that, in which this restoration is not only desired, but, also, fully and in all its relations, attained. Christianity offers itself to us, as such a religion, in which this restoration has been aimed at and fully accomplished in the incarnation of God in Christ.

Obs.—The ante-Christian Judaism, as an organic *first-step* of Christianity, is indeed a true, but not a perfect religion. Judaism and Christianity present no permanent contrast, but one of succession and development, something like blossoms and fruit.

### §3. *Instruction.*

Instruction in the Christian religion has, as its theme, the *nature, means and conditions* of fellowship with God, secured through the mediation of Christ. The source, from which it draws its propositions, is not *reason*, but the *Holy Scriptures* alone, in which the records of the Christian religion are contained and preserved. For Christianity is an historical religion, based upon historic facts, which no reason, of itself, can develop. Reason is indeed the medium, through which we are to grasp the contents of the Holy Scriptures and come to a clear, comprehensive and consistent knowledge of them.

### §4. *The Holy Scriptures.*

The books of the Holy Scriptures originated at different times and from various authors. The common object of their contents is, in general, the salvation, that is, the redemption and happiness of the human family through the restoration of fellowship with God. The contents of the Holy Scriptures divide themselves into *history* and *doctrine*. This last, again, into *law* and *gospel* (that is *glad tidings*—whether prophecy or preaching.) The *law* declares what God demands of man. The *gospel* declares what God gives, or will give to man.

### §5. *The Old and New Testaments.*

The Holy Scriptures naturally fall into two great divisions, according to *time, composition and contents*—viz: The Old and New Testaments. They differ, and have, as their boundary, the incarnation of God in Christ. The *former* contains the record of the *old covenant*, that is, the covenant



which God made with Abraham and his descendants, for preparing and indicating the way of salvation. The *latter* contains the record of the *new covenant*, which God, upon the basis of the salvation offered in Christ, has concluded with all people, so that they may appropriate and participate in this salvation.

Obs. 1. The collection of books called the *Old Testament*, as well as that, called the *New*, is termed the *Canon*,—that is, reed, measure, rule of conduct, because their contents are to be a divine rule of conduct for all Christian faith and life. The separate books, are called canonical books.

The *Old Testament Canon* comprises the following writings:

I. The record of the *founding* of the old covenant, viz: the *Thorah* (law, doctrine,) or the Pentateuch (five books, viz: Moses;) 1. Genesis, (origin;) 2. Exodus, (departure;) 3. Leviticus, (law;) 4. Numbers, (reckoning;) 5. Deuteronomy, (repetition of the law.)

II. *Historic* records of the old covenant: 1. Joshua; 2. Judges; 3. Ruth; 4. 2 Books of Samuel; 5. 2 Books of Kings; 6. 2 Books of Chronicles, (Paralipomena, that is, supplement;) 7. Ezra; 8. Nehemiah; 9. Esther.

III. Records of the *spiritual life* of the faithful under the old covenant: 1. Job; 2. Psalms; 3. Proverbs; 4. Ecclesiastes, (the Preacher;) 5. Song of Solomon.

IV. Records of the *prophets* of the old covenant:

(a) 1. Isaiah; 2. Jeremiah, (prophecies and lamentations;) 3. Ezekiel; 4. Daniel.

(b) 1. Hosea; 2. Joel; 3. Amos; 4. Obadiah; 5. Jonas; 6. Micah; 7. Nahum; 8. Habakkuk; 9. Zephaniah; 10. Haggai; 11. Zechariah; 12. Malachi.

The *New Testament Canon* contains the following writings:

I. The records of the *founding* of the new covenant, comprising the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

II. An *historic* record of the new covenant: Acts of the Apostles.

III. Records of the *doctrine* and *life*, under the new covenant:

(a) The epistles of Paul, the Apostle: 1. Epistle to the Romans; 2. Two Epistles to the Corinthians; 3. Epistle to the Galatians; 4. Epistle to the Ephesians; 5. Epistle to

the Philippians; 6. Epistle to the Colossians; 7. Two Epistles to the Thessalonians; 8. Two Epistles to Timothy; 9. Epistle to Titus; 10. Epistle to Philemon, (pastoral or shepherd's letter.)

(b) The *catholic* epistles, which were not written to particular congregations, but to Christians in general: 1. Two Epistles of Peter; 2. Three Epistles of John; 3. Epistle to the Hebrews; 4. Epistle of James; 5. Epistle of Jude.

IV. A record of the prophetic period of the new covenant, viz: Revelation of John, (Apocalypse.)

Obs. 2. As an appendix to the canonical books of the Old Testament, most editions of the Bible contain a number of books, called Apocryphal. These are books, written by pious men, (who were instructed from the Old Testament,) after its Canon had been closed and immediate inspiration been suspended for a season. They are not less valuable as *historical productions*, occupying a middle ground between the Old and New Testament, than as *witnesses* of the pious frames of mind, and of the faith of that period of the development of God's kingdom.

The Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, according to the order in which they are found in German Bibles, is the following: 1. Judith; 2. Wisdom of Solomon; 3. Tobias; 4. Jesus Sirach; 5. Baruch; 6. Two books of Maccabees; 7. A fragment of Esther; 8. History of Susannah; 9. Bel of Babel; 10. The Dragon of Babel; 11. Prayer of Asarias; 12. The Song of the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace; 13. The prayer of Manassah.

### §6. *The Word of God.*

The Holy Scriptures have been written by man for men; have been collected and handed down by him; nevertheless they deserve, in the fullest sense, the title of *the Word of God*. For the holy men of God, (prophets and apostles,) who wrote them, have not recorded their own human wisdom, but that wisdom and knowledge, which the Spirit of God by immediate illumination (inspiration) has produced in their spirits. The composition of the records of the Christian religion, if they are to be at all an infallible source of all Christian knowledge and an absolute rule of all Christian faith and life; if they are to be a defense against all human wisdom and an unabridged presentation

of divine truth, must\* be done under the immediate supervision and co-operation of the Holy Ghost. This same Holy Ghost, through whose supervision the Holy Scriptures, as the basis of the knowledge and promulgation of salvation for all coming centuries, have originated, must also see that the same is handed down essentially unadulterated and unbridged. This has reference, as well to the Old† as to the New‡ Testament. (Compare §264 and §309).

### §7. *The Lutheran System of Doctrine.*

Our religious instruction shall not be merely "Christian," but also, since we are a member of the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church, shall accord with its system of doctrine. This is presented in the confessional writings of the Church or the Symbolical Books. (§288). These are not *sources* of knowledge, but the evidence and statement of the truth, as acknowledged by the Evangelical Lutheran Church, or the understanding of the plan of salvation, which it has obtained, through the mediate illumination of the Holy Ghost. (§270) from the word of God in the ever-progressive development of the doctrines, therein recorded. (§309).

Obs.—The *confessional writings* are of two kinds: ecumenical (universal,) and particular symbols. The former presents a treasury of Christian knowledge, common to all Churches. They are three:

1. The *Apostolic Symbol*, which is an amplification of the baptismal formula of Matt. 28 : 19, and presents, in short sentences, the simplest fundamental truths of Christianity.

\*"That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." 1 Cor. 2 : 5.

†2 Peter 1 : 21.—"For the prophecy came not in old time by will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Timothy 3 : 16.—"All scripture is given by inspiration of God," &c. (§309, 2.)

‡Matt. 10 : 20.—"For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father, which speaketh in you." John 14 : 25.—"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 16 : 13.—"Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." Gal. 1 : 11, 12.—"But I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man: for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 2 : 10-13.—(See Scriptures.)

2. The *Nicene Symbol*, which is an amplification of the Apostolic one. It originated and was adopted by the councils of Nice, (A. D. 325) and Constantinople, (A. D. 381), and confirmed the true and essential deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

3. The *Athanasian Symbol* has its name from the great teacher in the Church, Athanasius, (obit 373,) but it could not have been composed by him. It presents with splendid acuteness and perspicuity, besides the Church doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the more recently developed doctrine of the relation of the two natures in Christ.

The *Particular Symbols* present the doctrinal systems of separate churches, especially in other points of difference from other churches. The Evangelical Lutheran Church possesses the following :

1. *The Augsburg Confession*.—This is her chief Confession, and by means of which she constitutes herself a Church organization. It was composed by Melancthon, and publicly read and presented to the Confessor, at the Imperial Diet of Augsburg, A. D. 1530. It contains twenty-one articles of faith and doctrine, and seven others, concerning which there is dissension, in which abuses are stated and the needful changes made.

2. *The Apology of the Augsburg Confession*.—Also composed by Melancthon.

3. *The Smalcald Articles*, composed by Luther, and presented to the Protestant princes in 1537, at their meeting in Smalcald.

4. *The Smaller Catechism*, designed for the people and youth.

5. *The Larger Catechism*, designed for ministers.

6. *The Formula Concordia*, issued in 1579, contains a scientific confirmation and further development of Lutheran Church doctrine.

In the *Reformed Churches* each country has its own Confession. For the most part they regard the Heidelberg Catechism, published in 1563, as generally sufficient. The *Decrees of the Council of Trent* (1545-1563) constitute the chief Confession of the Roman Catholic Church. The orthodox Greek Church has its faith set forth in the Confessio Orthodoxa of Peter Mogilas, metropolitan of Kiev. (1642.)

§8. *The Fundamental Doctrine.*

As the chief and fundamental doctrine of Christendom, in distinction from other religions, is the restoration of that fellowship with God, through the incarnation of God in Christ, which was destroyed by sin: (§3.) so is the chief and fundamental doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in distinction from other Confessions, the following: 'That we can participate in this restoration, not by any works of our own, but only by grace through faith.' This doctrine is the *essential principle* of our Church. Very intimately connected with it is the *model principle* of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 'That the Holy Scriptures are the only source and rule of all Christian knowledge.' For just as we are unable by our own power and merit to obtain salvation, so are we unable to draw a knowledge of it from our own reason and wisdom.

Obs.—This *model principle* is thus expressed in the Introduction to the Formula Concordiæ: "We believe, teach and confess, that the only rule and standard, according to which all doctrines and teachers alike ought to be tried and judged, are the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments alone, as it is written, Psalm 119: 105—"Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." St. Paul, Gal. 1: 8, says—"Though an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

This *essential principle* is thus taught in Article IV. of the Augsburg Confession: "It is taught further, that we cannot obtain righteousness and the forgiveness of sin before God, by our own merits, work and atonement; but that we obtain the remission of sins, and are justified before God, by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith." This doctrine is, (Art. XX.) "The principal article in the Christian Creed," or as the Apology of the Augsburg Confession (Art. IV.) more amply expresses it: "The principal and most important article of the whole Christian doctrine, which contributes especially to a clear, correct apprehension of all the Holy Scriptures, and which alone shows the way to the unspeakable treasure and the true knowledge of Christ: yea, which is the only key to the whole Bible, and without which the poor conscience can have no true, invariable, fixed hope, nor conceive the riches of the grace of Christ."



§9. *The Most Suitable Order.*

The most suitable division of a course of religious instruction, according to the Evangelical Lutheran system, is, that in the *first* place, it teaches our inability to be sanctified and saved by our power and merit. (Part I. of the Divine Law,) In the *second* place, how, by the grace of God in Christ, salvation and blessedness are prepared for us, and through faith may be appropriated. (Part II. of Christian Faith.) *Lastly*, What means God has furnished to our faith, by which it may secure the appropriation of this salvation. (Part III. The Christian Means of Grace.)

Obs.—This division recommends itself also, as the most suitable for instruction in the Christian religion, because it corresponds very closely to the course which God himself has pursued, as well in training the whole human race, as he yet continues to pursue in disciplining individuals for their salvation.

§10. *Luther's Catechisms.*

Among the symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, both Catechisms of Luther follow this order. Of these we select the Smaller Catechism, as the basis of our religious instruction, because it is the shortest and most comprehensive, and at the same time presents the truths of the Christian plan of salvation with the most admirable clearness, conciseness, power, penetration and simplicity.

Obs.—One of the greatest historians of our times, *L. Ranke*, thus expresses himself concerning the Smaller Catechism of Luther: "The Catechism, which Luther issued in 1529, concerning which he says, that "he repeats it himself, although he is an old doctor," is as childlike as it is profound, as comprehensible as it is unfathomable, as simple as it is sublime. Happy is he who nourishes his soul with it, who holds fast to it. He possesses an imperishable comfort for every moment. It is only a thin shell which covers the kernel of truth that satisfies the wisest of the wise." (Compare the Preface of the first edition of "*Instruction in the Christian Religion*.")

## ARTICLE III.

## PAUL, THE MISSIONARY APOSTLE.

By REV. M. OFFICER, A. M., Lancaster, Pa.

Whether Paul was numerically the thirteenth Apostle, or was one of the twelve, as being intended to supersede Matthias, who was appointed by the eleven in the place of Judas, it is, at least, evident, that his Apostleship was of special design, and somewhat peculiar in character. He was the Missionary Apostle. The Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to him. He received an Apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations, and was a chosen vessel to bear Christ's name before the Gentiles. He was, therefore, the special agent of God to inaugurate the aggressive operations of the Gospel among the nations and, as such, was to invade the Pagan regions round about, and introduce into them a new and regenerating power—to penetrate into the dark places of the earth with the brilliant light of Divine truth—to stir the slumbering heathen with the thrilling news of salvation, and to institute great changes in the very foundations of human society, as it then existed; and therefore his work was in its nature radical and aggressive.

For this peculiar work the Apostle received a special preparation. He was endowed with great clearness and force of intellect, with an ardent temperament and remarkable energy of will; all of which conspired to impart unity, earnestness and determination to his natural character, and thus lay the ground work of those peculiarities that his calling so much required.

He was, moreover, solemnly assured of the Divine purpose concerning him, by Ananias, at the time of his entrance into a renewed state; so that, under the most impressive circumstances, his mind was turned to the great subject of his Gentile mission, and could not fail to become deeply interested therein, as, he would reflect on the revelation that had been made, and anticipate the momentous work, to which he was to be devoted.

But that which still more entered into this preparation, was the peculiar phase of his early Christian experience,

which imparted a radical and aggressive turn to his whole religious life from its beginning, onward.

He was not, as is often the case, gradually and almost imperceptibly brought into a religious experience, faint at first and indecisive ; by diligent attention to the doctrines and rites of religion ; by earnestly striving to conform to religious precepts, and by habitually cherishing religious sentiments and emotions ; but on the contrary, his call to Christian life was directly from the Lord, himself, and his conversion was remarkably sudden, and even violent.

While on his way to Damascus, "yet breathing out threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," he was arrested by Divine power, and smitten to the earth. A light, more brilliant than that of the noonday sun, fell upon him and around him. A voice, which thrilled through all his being, called him by name and demanded the reason for his heartless persecution ; and then added, what he now, doubtless, began to know by experience, that it was hard to endure the goadings of a guilty conscience, and to contend with the arm of Omnipotence. "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." Nor did the deep sense of guilt under which this once self-righteous Pharisee was now brought, pass away, till he was made to know the deadly nature of sin, and the need of a Saviour, more efficacious than the bare forms, in which he had been accustomed to trust. For during his three consecutive days of gloom and wretchedness, he doubtless realized that "the wages of sin is death ;" that he was "carnal, sold under sin ;" and it was then especially, that he could exclaim : "Oh wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?"

Deliverance from this woful state came by the efficacy of the Gospel, and on the easy terms of simple faith. The call of Jesus Paul had heard in the way, and had given it his most earnest attention. The testimony of Ananias was now added, and Paul believed it, and in believing experienced salvation. He was "filled with the Holy Ghost." The scales fell from his eyes, and he was made a "new creature." "Old things had passed away," and "all things had become new." "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus had made him free from the law of sin and death." There was now "no condemnation." The Gospel had become to him "*the power of God unto salvation.*"

And now the direct, almost violent, and yet simple manner of his conversion, could not fail to infuse into the very first puttings forth of the new life something of the radical and aggressive spirit, by which the change itself was characterized. It would become inwrought into his Christian life from its origin, and so constitute him inwardly an aggressive or missionary Christian. At the same time, too, the quickening energy and joyous emotions of the new life, which he so sensibly felt, would prompt him to testify abroad the excellence of the Gospel, by which they had been conferred: and his fresh remembrance of the miseries of sin, which he had so keenly suffered, would impel him to declare the Gospel to all the unregenerate of his race, as a remedy for that great evil. Thus his inner promptings or emotions were in the direction of his appointed work. He was inwardly, as well as outwardly, called to this special Apostleship.

A corresponding effect would also be produced upon the mind or intellect, and his conceptions or impressions concerning the nature and operations of the Gospel would partake of the same aggressive cast. In his view, the ruling characteristics of the Gospel would be vitality, power and simplicity. It was life, for he felt its thrill through his whole being. It was power, for it had arrested him in his most determined pursuit, and for a while had prostrated him in the deepest gloom and misery, and then had raised him up again in the sweet joy of a new spiritual state. It was simplicity, for he only believed, and was saved.

But these conceptions had not yet matured into distinct and settled views or opinions. They were rather notional, and could either be developed to their logical result, by thought and reflection, or by being brought into contact with other and different views, held by other Apostles, could be modified and made to conform to some other system more definitely fixed. And it is remarkable and significant, that time and a fitting opportunity were afforded for their full and free development, according to their own tendency and nature. For although Paul associated somewhat with the other Apostles, and, no doubt, from them, as well as from other private disciples, learned the Christian traditions of that period, yet he does not seem to have received from them any special instruction in regard to his Apostolic office or work. On the contrary, he distinctly states, that the Gospel, which he preached, he did not receive from man, but was taught it by the revelation of Jesus Christ. He says,

"Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them, which were Apostles before me; but I went into Arabia and returned again to Damascus. Then, after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother." (Gal. 1: 17.)

For some reason, therefore, Paul soon after his conversion, instead of repairing to the other Apostles for special instruction, as might have been expected, retired to Arabia, and there spent three years in comparative solitude. Here then without any counteracting influences, by the teachings of the more Judaic Apostles, he was left free to reflect on the marvellous experience, through which he had just passed, to follow out in his own mind the rational consequences of the impressions which he had received, and thus, to some extent, to form a system of doctrine in accordance with them. So that his notions and conceptions, before crude and unsteady, would now settle down into well defined and systematic views. Nor does it appear that the special revelations, which he received of the Lord, were in any way different from that system, so as to modify it; but on the contrary, the fact itself, that the doctrines and institutions of the Gospel were communicated to him directly from heaven, without the intervention of the other Apostles, would add to the clearness and freshness of his views and the independent character of his Apostleship.

During this protracted period of retirement and reflection, too, the new life power, that he had received and that was so deeply tinged with an aggressive cast, would bring all the functions and powers of his being more completely under its control. The mind, the affections, the will, and even the bodily activities, which at first yielded reluctantly, or not at all to the new authority and force within him, would, through time and by exercise, be brought to a free and ready obedience. And Paul, who before was made a *subject* of the Gospel's power unto salvation, would now become a willing *instrument* of that power unto the same grand end in others.

To this complete embodiment of the mission idea, as now formed in the person of Paul, there would be given the highest degree of enthusiasm and determination by his anticipation of the trials and sufferings to be endured. There was appended to the original announcement of his appointment, the impressive warning: "I will show him how great things



he must suffer for my name's sake." This challenge to his Christian fortitude and endurance, frequently dwelt upon in the mind, would but inspire him with higher determination; for as the hard steel best draws fire from the flint, so this prospective suffering would call forth from his earnest nature the most profound and lofty resolution and devotion to his appointed work. It would bring him still more fully under the inspiration of his peculiar Apostleship.

Thus a peculiarly radical and aggressive element was imbibed by the Apostle with his very Christian existence, and, developing with that existence, wrought into its own nature. It flowed out into both his religious emotions and his Gospel system, and thus entering into his whole religious theory, his character and life, imparted to them a wonderful degree of enthusiasm, freshness and force: and then the peculiar circumstances, in which, in the earlier part of his Christian life, he was placed, together with the manner and attendants of his missionary call, all contributed to the fuller development of these same traits, till the missionary process was completed.

Having thus undergone his preparation for the great work before him, he only lingers a little in incipient missionary labors at various places, till the final order is given at Antioch for his separation from his brethren, save Barnabas, his co-laborer, and his departure to the Pagan island of Cyprus, and the no less Pagan regions of Asia Minor.

The precise extent of his missionary travels and labors is not certainly known, though it is clear that he made three great tours, besides his protracted journey to Rome, and that he continued in his evangelical work to the close of his life. But the method and spirit of these labors are in a high degree distinctive, and are the practical, logical result of his strongly marked religious experience, and of the theory that naturally arose out of that experience.

In accordance with his own experimental knowledge, of the Gospel as a new creative power, his method of propagating it was to thrust it far out into the unbroken wilds of Paganism, and there to let it originate anew the Christian community. His rule was not to build on the foundations, laid by others, but to go where Christ had not been named. (Rom. 15: 20.) It is true, that he, sometimes, watered the plantings of others, when, in his journeyings, he came upon

them, and that he also earnestly endeavored to persuade to the Christian faith the obdurate Jews, wherever he met them, but his great efforts and great successes were among the Gentile races; and he never sought a cultivated field, nor did he wait for any preparation by tedious educational processes, but penetrated at once into the masses of the heathen populace.

And even, when, in the wide fields which he traversed, he had effected Christian organizations, so fully did he rely on the life principle within them, finally to work out its proper result, that he soon withdrew from their immediate supervision and control, and passed on again to new and untried fields. In some instances he remained longer than in others, but still his rule was not to delay after effecting the organization and appointing a local pastor, but to depart to "regions beyond." When he had founded the Church at Corinth, although there were, doubtless, great numbers at that place who were yet unconverted and even untaught, yet he writes to the Romans that he had no more place in those parts, but purposed soon to take his journey into the distant country of Spain. (Rom. 15: 23, 24.) On the island of Crete he did not even wait to complete the organizations, and, therefore, charged Titus, whom he had left there, for that purpose, to "set in order the things that were wanting and to ordain elders in every city." (Titus 1: 5.) And although his earnest care for the churches continued and his epistles to them were most ample and faithful in instruction, in reproof and encouragement, and though he occasionally visited them in person, yet it seems that the churches themselves were to apply these instructions, and to administer the needful correction and discipline. This method not only enabled the Apostle to devote himself to leading on the aggressions of the Gospel in new and unoccupied regions, but also caused the churches to assume their proper responsibilities, to enter practically upon their duties, and thus, by exercise, to promote their spiritual growth and develop their effective powers. He was, therefore, most diligent in organization, but it was organization properly, not a mere arrangement, but the embodiment and outer expression of a life. It was organization like that of the oak from the acorn, like that of the body around the soul, and hence the human body becomes his favorite illustration of the church or congregation.

In raising up these organizations of regenerated men, he, in accordance with his evangelical system, relied on the simple preaching of the word, or declaration of the truth. He most emphatically declared that in his ministry or Apostleship, he renounced all craftiness, and even deceitful or unfair handling of the word of God, and sought simply by a "*manifestation of the truth*," to commend himself and his Gospel to the consciences of men. (2 Cor. 4 : 1, 2.) He did not neglect the simple rites and ordinances of Christianity, apart from those of Judaism, but his one plain declaration, that "Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel," (1 Cor. 1 : 17,) shows clearly enough, especially with the connection in which it stands, that the preached word or the truth was the great means, that he employed to regenerate men and propagate the Gospel. He endeavored to produce within men convictions of the truth, and by these convictions, attended by the promised Spirit, to convert and save them. So far from relying on any regenerative power in rites and ceremonies themselves, he gave them no special prominence as mediums of regeneration, or as exhibitions of the truth, but in a more direct way declared the great facts, doctrines and duties of the Gospel, seeking thus to reach the conscience, and from within to reform the character and life.

Nor was he satisfied, till the truth had really effected a new spiritual state. His ruling idea was that of a renewed nature, as necessary in the case of every man. He insisted, that the essential thing in religion was neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, but a "*new creature*." He declares that those who have not the spirit of Christ are none of his. So spiritual was his whole conception of the Gospel, that he calls it "the ministration of the spirit," (2 Cor. 3 : 8,) and with marked satisfaction he reminds the Corinthians, that his preaching among them was, "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." (1 Cor. 2 : 4.) And though he was always attentive to sound doctrine, yet he maintains that the letter kills while the spirit gives life; and he deeply mourns over some of the Galatians who, having begun in the Spirit, were about to end in the flesh.

He was not content, either to teach these things by theory only, but he seems to have constantly aimed to keep himself fully under their influence and power, that they might effect within him their blessed results, and thus enable him so to walk in them as to present to others an example for their

instruction and encouragement. He calls the attention of the Philippians (Phil. 3: 12,) to the fact, that he strove to apprehend that for which he also was apprehended of Christ Jesus—to keep his soul responsive to the call of his Lord—to have all his powers under the inspiration of the divine life and divine purpose concerning him, to maintain a living union with the Lord, by laying hold on Christ, as Christ had laid hold on him, and not be borne along unconsciously or passively, as inert matter, or a spiritless slave, by some outward, impelling force.

This regenerate, spiritual state, which the Apostle sought first of all and most of all, to promote, in himself first and then in others, which he made the essence of the Christian brotherhood and the basis of the Christian organization, he taught, was to be attained and maintained by simple faith in Christ. As his own experience had been, so he taught, that justification and salvation came by faith, and not by the deeds of the law. This great evangelical doctrine he seemed to regard as distinctively Christian, and never allowed it to be ignored or obscured; and he constantly warned his converts against the dangerous character of the legal and Judaic system, that stood opposed to it.

He sought, however, to establish and to extend it in its own free and liberal spirit, and therefore was fully satisfied with the decision of the Apostolic council at Jerusalem—that those, who had been born and reared Jews, might still retain certain Jewish practices, if these practices were not held as essential to Christianity, and made binding on the churches that he had established, or on Gentile converts. He was willing that these should remain, till the warning and softening influence of Christianity would naturally dissolve them away. But, when soon afterward, at Antioch, Peter conducted himself in such a manner as to imply that there was a difference between the two classes of Christians, that those of Gentile origin, who embraced the faith system and did not observe the Judaic rites, were of a lower order, and of less Christian attainment and excellence, he met the insinuation with open and indignant rebuke; charging Peter before all the brethren with dissimulation, and demonstrating in the clearest manner his inconsistency. (Gal. 2: 11-14.) In his view there was to be liberty; for that was the genius of the Gospel, as he apprehended and embraced it. The more legal, the more free and spiritual views and practices were to be allowed to commend themselves respectively



to the Church, but in the common brotherhood there was to be no reproach cast upon those who, being more distinctively Christian, attained to righteousness through faith and omitted the ceremonies of Judaism.

Thus while Paul did not cut himself and his system entirely off from the Jewish dispensation, historically, nor deny the importance of its mission, but recognized its substance as latent Christianity itself; and saw in its rigor a preparation for the more free and spiritual system, acknowledging that its legal character served as a school-master to bring the world to Christ. Yet he, in some degree, and in a higher degree, too, than any other of the Apostles, regarded it as a new creation, and represented it as less historical, less derived, less formal and ritual than did any other.

It appears, therefore, that the whole missionary career of this Apostle to the Gentiles, his labors, his teachings and his whole life, were marked by that peculiarly aggressive and radical cast, which characterized his earliest religious experience. But radical as were these labors, there is no room for speculation as to the nature and extent of their results. Even in his own day Paul was accused to hush the voice of cavil and reproach against his simple and seemingly irregular Apostleship, by appealing to his labors and their results in the vast and various fields, in which they had been put forth. And so marvellous were they, that he did not claim them as the effect of his own powers, but of "the grace of God that was with him."

In the *extension* of the Church abroad—a thing which, from the beginning till now, has been so much desired—his labors surpassed those of all the rest of the Apostolate. The churches, established by him, were to be found in almost every kingdom and province then known to the civilized world. Nor were these churches of an insignificant character; for many of them soon became very prominent in the entire Christian community. The organizations, which he founded in Asia Minor during the earlier part of his missionary career, became the main branch of the Christian Church, even before the close of the Apostolic age; and to them, as the representative church, was the Apocalypse, the last book of the holy Canon, given, in trust for the whole body. The feeble branches had thus already become the main-stem, the outposts had become the strong-holds, and the principle seat of Christianity had been transferred to Pagan soil.



To the inner *culture* of the Church, his labors also very largely contributed, both directly and indirectly. The Gospel, as a new and active element in the world, now borne abroad and thrust into the midst of the most populous and enterprising portions of the earth, began at once to infuse itself into whatever it could adopt and consecrate to its uses, to dissolve and clear away whatever stood in essential hostility to it, and to adjust itself in its outer form to whatever, as belongs simply to this world's economy, might remain, and yet could not be directly dedicated and employed for its purposes. And the history of these manifold operations, as authoritative examples and illustrations of the practical effects and requirements of the Gospel, having come down to the succeeding ages of the Church, in the book entitled "*The Acts of the Apostles.*" affords to the Church the most plain directions possible, on almost all the points of conflict between it and the world.

The withdrawal of Paul, moreover, from the immediate control of the mission churches, even before their internal affairs were fully adjusted, or the members were fully trained in the doctrines and duties of their profession, gave occasion for detailed, special and thorough instruction, by writing. And as the Apostle was not unmindful of these duties, but exercised a daily care for all the churches, there are given, in his various epistles, the most clear and full statements of Christian precepts, the most thorough discussion, doctrines and the most complete adjustment of great principles of action, that could be desired.

But more than this. The direct way in which Paul was made acquainted with the Gospel, without the intervention of anything Judaic, and the consequent independence of his Apostleship and labors, led to the discussion of the relations of Christianity to Judaism; and hence, especially in Paul's epistles to the Romans, the Galatians and the Hebrews, there are presented those profound and clear exhibitions of this subject, that settled the question, and caused the Church practically to enter into the freedom and spirituality of the Gospel system.

Thus have the records of Paul's missionary labors and epistles that he wrote to his mission churches ever been, from the time of their composition down to the present period, the great source of instruction and edification to the Church. Who can read the Apostle's letters to Timothy

and Titus, and not know something of the proper relation and feeling of the elder to the junior members of the Christian ministry, and of the ministry to the Church? Who can peruse his delineations of right conduct and bearing in the ruler, the subject, the husband, the wife and the child, and not perceive the deep significance and exalted excellence of all these relations, as they are, "*in the Lord.*" Or who can dwell even, for a moment, on the touching scene of his last interview with the elders of Ephesus (Acts 20,) and not know, and also, feel something of the blessed endearments of Christianity.

On the subject of this missionary Apostle's contributions to the indoctrination and culture of the Church, one\* of the most profound scholars and theologians of the present day has given the following emphatic testimony: "No other Apostle has given us so profound and complete an exhibition of the doctrines of sin and grace, of the law and the Gospel, of the eternal conception and temporal unfolding of the plan of redemption, of the person and work of the Redeemer, of justifying faith and Christian life, of the Holy Ghost, of the Church and the means of grace, of the resurrection and consummation of salvation. In the small compass of thirteen epistles, Paul has crowded together more genuine spirit, profound thought, and true wisdom, than are to be found in the whole mass of classical, or even, of post-Apostolic Christian literature. He, who does not see in this an overwhelming proof of the Divine and incomparable glory of Christianity, must have, either his heart or his head, in the wrong place. Already have eighteen centuries been industriously laboring to expound, digest and apply, in sermons, commentaries and numberless other works, the dogmatical and ethical contents of Paul's system of doctrine and still it is not exhausted."

The *spirituality* and *reformatory power* of the Church, also largely results from the labors of the Apostle to the Gentiles. The history of the Church has abundantly shown that her great danger is that of lapsing into indifference to vital and practical piety, and substituting therefore imposing forms and material display. The lingering remains of Judaism still afflict her. There is still a tendency to be made perfect in the flesh. And the remedy for this evil is the same as of old—the simple evangelical system of Paul.

\*Schaff's Apostolic Church, p. 640.

This system induces first in the individual a struggle for a renewed state, and then, also, extends that struggle out into the Church, and community abroad. This system is peculiarly free and effective, and has always characterized the liberal, aggressive and reformatory movements in the Church. It is essentially the system of Protestantism itself: and hence all true reformers have ever borne a strong resemblance, in their spirit and doctrinal views, to this Apostle. All truly reformatory movements have been re-enactments of Paul's conflict with Judaism, and their appeals have always been made to his writings.

When towards the close of the middle ages, the spirit of Christianity was smothering beneath an intolerable accumulation of forms and externalities, and the Church, the congregation of believing worshippers, was supplanted by swarms of idle and vicious recluses, and immoral, arrogant and tyrannical priests, lurking in huge and massive monasteries and cathedrals, whose dungeon vaults and ponderous heap fitly represented the darkness, grossness and materialism of the times, Paul reappeared in the person of Luther and his doctrine of justification by faith, and not by lifeless forms and rites, again pervading the masses, dissolved the cold grasp of legalism, and ushered in anew the living power and spiritual freedom of the Gospel.

This untiring, aggressive, radical and reconstructive tendency will always be felt and manifested in the Church, and through the Church, upon the world, so long as the writings of Paul constitute a part of its teachings and his example is presented to its view. His labors must, more or less, repeat themselves in every age, while there are nations remaining in Pagan darkness, and while ritualism and materialism oppress the Church.

How largely, therefore, in every way, have the labors of this Apostle contributed to the welfare of the Church, to its extension abroad, to its culture and proper development within, and to its regenerative and effective force! These labors, more than any others by man, gave it its first broad dimensions in the earth, its manual of doctrine and worship and multiplied activities, and its penetrative reformatory power. The aggressiveness of these labors conquered for it a quiet home and wide possessions in the land of its foes, their independence and originality brought it to realize its own distinctive character, and secured to it its freedom and unrestricted rights: and their radicalism conserved its true

life-power, or vital and energising force. And thus has it been demonstrated, that aggressiveness on the part of the Church is its surest mode of defense, and that true radicalism, the thrusting forward of fundamental truths and principles, is the only true conservatism; that both the Church and the world will be saved, if saved at all, by the truth, and not aside from it.

Such is the aggressive side or phase of the Gospel; and while all this constitutes no ground for denying to that same Gospel another side or aspect, characterized more by culture and attention to what is of historic authority and force, it may, at least, be claimed that this shall not be ignored, or set aside. For, even if an ideal of the Church, in some degree true, can be constructed, embracing only its educational aspect, its spirit of nurture and modes of care and training within its fold, such an ideal, for the present times or dispensation, at least, will be one-sided, and cannot be realized. And if following such a one-sided ideal, the Church should conclude that the main or only things needed are a formal assent to some nicely adjusted theory of religion, and a sort of skill and facility in the use of certain formulas, then must her glorious mission abroad remain unaccomplished, and there must soon come upon her a nightmare of formalism, sooner or later, again to be broken and dispelled by the trumpet voice and thrilling presence of evangelical reforms, making itself some additional history worthy, afterward, to be studied.

In theory, it might seem that Christianity, being, in a large degree, an out-growth of Judaism, would quietly merge into being, and without a struggle or a sigh, would enter the place made vacant for it by its retiring predecessor; that nothing irregular would occur, especially in the call and preparation of any of its chief Apostles, but that their due number, and no more, would be made full, by a regular appointment, on the part of those already empowered, and that they would all be trained together in mutual dependence and harmony. But this is not the fact. Its inauguration was vastly different. It took place amid fierce conflicts and cruel sorrows, and not without involving some seeming irregularities. For the series of events connected with the Apostleship of Paul certainly have something extraordinary about them, which does not fit into the mechanism of fixed order."

Christianity is a great living fact, as well as a code of doctrines, and is actively operating in a world of multiform hinderances and oppositions, and while it always aims at one and the same great end, the salvation of men, through regeneration and sanctification, and while its means and methods, as a whole, are pervaded by unvarying laws, and make up one grand scheme, fully comprehended by the Divine mind, they are too free and varied and, taken entire, are too broad, to be compressed into the narrow mechanical and one-sided systems, to which men of the various schools have generally attempted to subject them.

Rather then let the spirit of evangelical aggression, as well as that of motherly nurture and watchful training, abide in the Church. Let the exercise of the Church's aggressive functions give it health and growth; and let its spiritual culture maintain and increase its power of aggression and extension. Let the Apostleship of Paul to the uncircumcision, and that of Peter to the circumcision, mutually recognize each other, as of old.

Or, if ever a time shall come, when this missionary Apostleship, with the peculiar phase of Christianity which it has induced shall subside and pass away in the Church, giving place to the *school* of Christ alone, which then shall embrace, by descent from a pious parentage, the whole race of man, and with holy nurture, rear them from their birth in the love and fear of the Lord, it must be after these aggressions have gone much farther, and have brought that parentage throughout the world into the pale of the Church, at least, if not into living sympathy with the experimental and practical holiness, required by the Gospel. Hence the mission of the Church to them, that are without, is not yet fulfilled. Its ingathering is not yet complete. Its conquests are not all made. Unless it would fail to make full proof of its calling, a little longer, it must bear the sword of conquest, and guide the heaving plough-share of truth through the neglected wastes abroad and fruitless fields at home.



## ARTICLE IV.

## THE CHRIST OF HISTORY.

By H. S. DICKSON, D. D., Lewisburg, Pa.

Renan, in his late work, has attempted to write the life of Christ; but we think that every intelligent Christian reader will rise from the perusal of it with the conviction that it is an entire failure. His book presents conclusive evidence of the writer's ability and scholarship, but from the stand-point which he occupied, it was impossible for him to form anything approaching a true estimate of the person and character of the Son of God. Denying a supernatural Revelation and assuming that religion is altogether subjective, that Christian dogma is an obsolete form of philosophy, he sets aside, in almost every instance, without examination, the Gospel record of Christ's supernatural works, on the ground, that the writers, though honest and well-meaning, were led by superstition and a love of the marvellous, then universally prevailing, to believe in the reality of the miracles, which they have recorded.

He has, however, a keen appreciation of the beauty of Christ's human character, and of the system of moral truth which fell, with so much sweetness, from his lips; and we are not without hope that he may yet be led from admiration to faith, that having learned to love him as a man, the highest and purest of his race, he may be brought, by the drawings of the Holy Spirit, to adore and worship him as "God over all, and blessed forever." And we are the more inclined to cherish this hope, because he has a mind of rarest delicacy, and because there occasionally drops from his pen symptoms of an inward melancholy wail, as the sigh of one who had sought for the truth and found it not.

If we admit, with Renan, that the Gospels were composed, during the latter half of the first century, by those whose names they bear, who were the daily companions of Christ and consequently eye-witnesses of the facts which they narrate and that we have these records now, in substantially the same form in which they were originally

written, we feel bound to admit this testimony as valuable and substantially true, on all matters that came under their own personal observation. We have an abiding confidence in human veracity on all matters of fact, and though no two persons would state the same occurrence, which they both witnessed, in precisely the same way, yet even their slight discrepancies would serve to confirm rather than shake our faith in their truthfulness. It is folly, with the Baconian philosophy in our hands, to start with the assumption that a miracle is impossible or incapable of proof. On the hypothesis, says J. Stuart Mills, that the universe is governed by an infinitely wise and Almighty God, a miracle is no infraction of nature's harmony and concord, and consequently is not beyond the reach of proof.\* We will not trouble ourselves with any definition of a miracle; our simple inquiry is, did certain things occur? Did Christ walk on the water? Those, who testify that he did, had the very best opportunities of knowing. They were on a boat, in the midst of a lake, about four miles from shore, "the sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew;" it was about four o'clock in the morning, when Jesus approached the vessel, walking on the water; "they all saw him and were afraid. And immediately he talked with them, he went up unto them in the ship; and they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God."† Now we do not see here any possibility of mistake or illusion. Matthew and John knew, with absolute certainty, that their narratives were true, or they knew that they were false; and we think that they are just as reliable and as worthy of credit, when they tell us what occurred on the Sea of Galilee, or at the tomb of Lazarus, as when penning the narrative of Christ's trial and crucifixion.

We must receive the Gospel Histories as true and worthy of all acceptance, or we must reject them as fictions. There is no middle course. For if they are a compound of fiction and fact, the fiction looks so much like the fact, that it would be impossible for any man, however great his skill, or extensive his culture, to draw one line of separation.

Apart, then, from all theories and preconceived opinions, let us approach Jesus of Nazareth by the path of history,

\*System of Logic, chap. 25.

†Matt. 14: 22-36. Mark 6: 45-56. John 6: 15-21.

the safest and surest road, in our judgment, to a satisfactory conclusion, on any subject of human thought. For we cannot prove that He, who appeared to the human eye a mere man, was the Son of God, unless we start from his humanity, about which there is no dispute. His history, in all its simple grandeur, when carefully studied, is the most powerful argument in favor of his Divinity and the truth of his doctrine, that can be presented to the human mind. Indeed, the more we study his character, as delineated by the Evangelists, the more deeply will we be impressed with its genuineness and reality. We see at once that it is no picture of the imagination; it bears the marks of truth, so palpable, so striking and so perfectly inimitable, that we cannot resist the conclusion to which the simple narrative is always conducting us. It sets before us the most extraordinary Being that ever appeared on earth, and yet, it continues throughout as artless and simple as the stories of childhood. The writers of the Gospels never appear to think of themselves. They had plainly but one aim, to tell us what Christ said and did, and they manifest their veneration for Him, by giving his actions and sayings without comment or eulogy; thus allowing Him to reveal himself. Never was such a biography written before or since; you see in it no coloring, no varnishing, no attempt to make his actions striking, to bring out the beauties of his character, or to conceal defects. They feel only the unspeakable importance of what they have to relate and their sole aim is to commit it to writing, in a plain and intelligible manner, for the benefit of others. They never once point us to any circumstance, as illustrative of his greatness or goodness, and they never stop the onward flow of the narrative to mingle therewith praise, explanation, or commentary. It surely must be on account of our great familiarity with the mere words, in which the history of Jesus of Nazareth is written, that we are not more deeply impressed by the perusal of it. The man, who has lived, since his birth, within sight and sound of the Falls of Niagara, sees little to admire in that, which attracts the more distant populations of all civilized nations.

Let us, then, look at some of the more important facts in the life of Jesus of Nazareth. The accounts of Matthew and Luke agree in stating, that the birth of Christ was the result of a direct creative act of God, and not of the ordinary laws of human generation. John tells us that He who, by this

act became, man was in the beginning with God, was God, the Creator of all things and the source of all spiritual life, which is the light of man. Without the assumption of this first truth, that *Christ is the Son of God, in a sense which cannot be predicated of any creature*, the perfect image of the personal God in the form of humanity, his life must ever appear to the diligent inquirer unintelligible and inharmonious. On any other supposition we are continually startled by declarations, which never could have fallen from the lips of a sane man. Did ever enthusiast, since the days of Adam, carry his madness to such a height, as to use such language as this, "He that hath seen *me*, hath seen the Father, *I and the Father are one* I am the light of the world. Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." He, who could present himself to mankind in such a light, who could, with Divine confidence, invite all to come to him, to satisfy the cravings of their higher nature, must have possessed within himself an infallible conviction of his Divinity. This view of the person of Christ was so deeply impressed on the minds of his immediate followers, that they obeyed Him implicitly and worshipped Him, as God. It was this new element, this direct revelation of Christ to their souls that made them, what they were, and that crowned their labors with success; and now, as then, it enters into the Christian consciousness of the entire people of God, as an enduring and victorious power, which meets and satisfies a fundamental want of human nature.

The very circumstances, in which He first appeared among us, proclaimed, at once, his greatness and condescension. His assumption of human nature, and voluntarily submitting to all the calamities He endured for the sake of men, exhibit a degree of benevolence, magnanimity and patience which far exceed the conception that Plato formed of the most tried and perfect virtue. "Being in the form of God, He took upon Him the form of a servant, made himself of no reputation," to the end, that He might accomplish a work so great that it never could have originated in a created mind. He came to conquer and redeem a world, to pour contempt on the high sounding titles of earthly grandeur, to converse with every possible scene of misery and to raise the poor out of the dung-hill. It would not, therefore, have become Him to have made his appearance amid the

shouts of prostrate thousands. Hence no palace sheltered his holy head; no vestments of purple shaded his limbs; no bending attendants received him from his mother's arms; no trumpets were blown throughout the land to announce the birth of the King of the Jews. The world frowned upon him from the beginning. Poverty waited on him in his cradle and accompanied him during his earthly sojourn. The Saviour and the brute reposed under a common shed. "He was despised and rejected of men, He was despised, and we esteemed him not."

Still his glory, though veiled from the eyes of men, was recognized in heaven. When He came into the world it was said, "Let all the angels of God worship him." They hastened to obey the command, to announce the glad tidings to the shepherds, who kept their flocks on the plains of Bethlehem, and sing their song of glory in the highest.

The circumstances of his birth were, therefore, contrary to all human calculations, to the hopes and anticipations which had been long cherished by Jews and Gentiles. From the groves of Athens, from the Tiber and the Ganges, as well as from the Jordan, men had, age after age, sent up their cries to heaven for a Deliverer; but few were willing to receive Him, when he came in the humble garb of poverty. Some thought He must come in all the pomp and circumstance of royalty, that He would be a great commander and fill the world with his fame, whilst others looked for a great teacher who would withdraw the veil of ignorance from all knowledge and deliver mankind from the bondage of error. When, therefore, the desire of all nations came, they received Him not. Though such, as their necessities demanded, He was not what they looked for. Only those who "beheld his glory, the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father," could recognize and receive Him. Let us, then, draw near to Him that our souls may bask in the light of his life.

He came among us, as we have already said, in the full consciousness of his Divinity, to accomplish an infinite work. He came in the dress of an ordinary man, assuming the form of a servant. He retreated to no solitude, like John, consecrated no particular place as sacred, but, on the contrary, proclaimed to the world a truth of the greatest originality and highest importance, that the human soul is the only true temple of God and that consequently the true worshipper worships Him in spirit and in truth. He has none of the wealth of the world, wears none of its honors.



has often not, even, where to lay his head. In every place he mingles with men, as a man and a brother, as a friend and sometimes as a servant. He enters with the most wonderful sympathy, into the wants, feelings and sorrows of individuals, even of the most despised and forsaken of the race. He receives them with a tenderness of compassion and a depth of affection, which must have appeared as wonderful to the cold spectators, as it was melting to the wretched sufferers. As I read his reply to the self-righteous Pharisees my astonishment has no bounds, "The whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick; I came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance." He went about doing good. He found himself in an afflicted world, and devoted himself to works of mercy. Mankind were ignorant and He instructed them; they were depraved and He reclaimed them; they were in sorrow and He comforted them; they were diseased and he healed them; they were oppressed and He delivered them. He performed these offices of benevolence, not only indirectly, or by the agency of others, but by his own personal and indefatigable efforts and labors. He passed, in this manner, the whole of his public life. Nothing could divert him from his course, not the deepest ingratitude from the objects of his kindness, not his own pressing necessities, not the greatest personal discouragements, not unrelenting persecution and the constant peril of life. He met unkindness, persecution and danger in every form; he met them unmoved and, having lived for man, he closed his brief career by the death of the cross.

If, then, we have looked attentively at the Son of God, we cannot have failed to have seen in him the spirit of humanity in its lowliest and tenderest form, combined with a full consciousness of his unrivalled dignity and ineffable glory. He cultivated the closest intimacy with the ignorant, degraded and the suffering. Though exalted in thought above every name that is named, he chose the poor and uneducated, as his immediate companions and friends. He travelled with them, from place to place, sat at their tables and slept in their humble dwellings; He communicated to them truth in its simplest forms, and though they continually misunderstood him, and never fully received his meaning, yet He was never weary in teaching them. His last address to them is truly wonderful; it stands alone, amid all the writings of the past, for never was there manifested

before, or since, such a union of tenderness and majesty. His own great sorrows are forgotten, in his anxiety to comfort them.

Nor was the manifestation of his tenderness and love confined to his disciples. There was no class of human beings, so low as to be beneath his sympathy. He not only taught publicans and harlots, the despised outcasts of society, but with a consciousness of purity, altogether divine, mingled with them at the social meal; and when reproved by the Pharisees for holding intercourse with such, answered, in the inimitable stories of the lost sheep and the prodigal son.

No personal sufferings ever dried up the fountain of love for man in his breast. On his way to Calvary he heard women, who had been blessed by his ministry, bewailing him and, forgetting his own great sorrows, for the moment, he turned and said, "Daughters of Jerusalem! weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children." Nay more, when his enemies, unsoftened by his last sorrows, mocked him on the cross, the sympathies of his nature were stirred to the lowest depth and broke forth in that wonderful prayer, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." "In Christ, who is his own religion alive and in action, sorrow and love seem to be evermore blended and lost in each other. He is the immortal image of both; love and pain are the foot-prints by which we trace him from page to page. And who shall say *which* was foremost on Calvary? Love drew the Godhead of Christ from the throne; and sorrow, sanctifying sorrow, lifted the manhood into meetness to share it."\*

As a Teacher, it is now universally admitted by the highest intellects of our race, that the officers sent to take him, spoke nothing but the literal truth in their report to the chief priests, "Never man spake like this man." The princes of literature and learning, in modern times, Fichte, Goethe and Carlyle, however unwilling to confess and acknowledge him, as their Saviour from sin and death, have cheerfully brought their treasures and laid them at his feet. The vulgar infidelity of the past century is now dead and can never be revived; and we think it an immense gain to the progress of Christian truth that the first thinkers of our age have placed Christ as a moral teacher immeasurably above all others. "Measure," says one, "the religious

\*Archer Butler.

doctrine of Jesus by the time and place, in which he lived, or by that of any time and place; yes, by the doctrine of eternal truth. Consider what a work his words and deeds have wrought in the world. Remember, that the greatest minds have seen no farther and have added nothing to the doctrines of religion; that the richest hearts have felt no deeper and have added nothing to the sentiment of religion; have set no loftier aim, no truer method than his, of perfect love to God and man. Measure him by the shadow he has cast into the world, not by the light he shed upon it. And shall we be told that such a man never lived? that the whole story is a lie?''\* He founded, says another, the pure worship, of no age, of no clime, which shall be that of all lofty souls to the end of time. Not only is his religion the benign religion of humanity, but it is the absolute religion; and if other planets have inhabitants, endowed with reason and morality, their religion cannot be different from that which Jesus proclaimed.''† "He did more than all the philosophers to bring heavenly morality into the hearts and homes of common men."‡ "He is the Divine man, the Holy One, the pattern, example and model of humanity."§ "He is the greatest of all heroes, whom we do not name here. Let sacred silence meditate that sacred matter."||

His preaching was sweet, and gentle and full of nature. He gave a tongue to the flowers of the field and the birds of the air; creation everywhere acknowledged him, as Lord and became vocal at his bidding. He uttered no half truths; every truth was seen by him in its completeness. He proclaimed the moral law, as given to Moses, to be universally and everlastingly binding; and he summed it up in this brief formula, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." God is our Father, to whom he invites us to draw near, recognizing the entire family of man as our brethren. And on this paternal relation of God to man, a relation which the teachers of other religions never conceived of as possible, he founded *the equal and inalienable rights of all men*. Human brotherhood in its broadest sense flows continually from his lips. He repudiates all claims founded on blood, or birth, sect or nation,

\*Theo. Parker's Life of Christ. 363. †Renan's Life of Christ. 215.

‡Fichte. §Goethe. ||Carlyle.

station or rank; all are the erring children of a common Father who sent him into the world to seek and to save the lost.

This was his mission, to this end he was born. His uniform conviction of the value of the human soul appears in all his acts and teachings. He saw in every man a spirit of inestimable value and, therefore, he longed and labored for its redemption from the burden and curse of sin. Looking on man with an eye which pierced the material covering, the body vanished at his glance; the trappings of the rich and the rags of the poor were nothing to him; he looked through them to the soul, as though they did not exist; and there, amid the darkness of ignorance and the corruptions of sin, he recognized a spiritual and immortal nature of more value than the whole material creation. This spiritual view of man pervades and distinguishes the words and acts of Jesus. In the most fallen and depraved, he saw a being who would live on forever, and who might become an angel of light and, therefore, he wept, because he would not let him fold him in the wings of his love. He came to live and die for the redemption of the lost; the garden and the cross were ever before him. "I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I straightened until it be accomplished?" But this was necessary to the redemption of the fallen, and, therefore, "he gave his back to the smiter and his cheek to them that plucked out the beard." The redemption of the soul was precious. Men might become like himself, "heirs of God and joint heirs with him to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and that fadeth not away." Nay, this was the eternal purpose of God with reference to all believers. They were "chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world, that they might be holy and without blame before him in love."

Thus Jesus lived among men. To a consciousness of unutterable majesty he added a lowliness, humility and sympathy, which can never have a parallel. But such a character is wholly remote from human conception. A character, so extraordinary, so divine, so consistent throughout, could not have been invented by the fishermen of Galilee. This is now admitted by all thinking men, who, in this age, are entitled to a hearing. We have the Gospel histories only because he, who is the subject of them, came out from God and dwelt among men, and they beheld his glory, as the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

But suppose, with Renan, that he was a mere man, strip him of every claim to the supernatural, admit that his miracles were all delusions, readily embraced by his disciples to give prominence to their dearly loved Master, then, Jesus himself becomes the greatest miracle the world ever dreamed of. There is nothing in the Bible, so utterly incredible as that Jesus of Nazareth, born and brought up a mechanic, should, at the age of thirty, without learning, without wealth, without any human or superhuman aid, have risen above all prejudices of family, age and nation, and laid the foundation of a universal and eternal religion which Renan calls, "the absolute religion," and adds, that "if other worlds be inhabited with intelligent and moral beings, their religion cannot be different from that which Jesus proclaimed.\*" The words of Jesus were a gleam in thick night: it has taken eighteen hundred years for the eyes of humanity to learn to abide it. But the gleam shall become the full day, and, after passing through all the circles of error, humanity will return to these words, as to the immortal expression of its faith and hopes." This is the miracle of miracles; you may deny all others, but this you cannot deny. Jesus is the miracle, which no ingenuity of man can explain away. It would be nothing to receive the most apparently incredible miracle, recorded in the Holy Scriptures, in comparison with the creed which Renan would impose upon the world.

But, perhaps, our readers need no argument to convince them that Jesus was the Son of God. They are Christians so far as the intellectual reception of the creed of the Church can make them such. It, however, becomes us all to inquire, whether we are such as we ought to be, such as Christ desires us to be? To show us how to live and how we must live, if we are his disciples, was one of the known ends for which he came into the world to dwell among men. We have, consequently, in his singular life the model to which our own must be conformed. Some may be ready, here at the very outset, to reply that in our weakness and with our many infirmities pressing upon us, we can hardly be expected to imitate very closely, a character so divinely perfect. But we shall endeavor to prove that Christ did cherish this expectation. "He that saith he abideth in him, ought to walk even as he also walked." And his own voice is still ringing in our ears in some of those expressive senten-

\*Life of Christ, 215.



tious sayings which fell with such weighty authority from his lips, "Follow me. I have given you an example, that you should do to others as I have done to you." This conformity of all believers to Christ was the predestined purpose of God. Jesus died to redeem us from the dominion of sin. Hence we were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, that we might be holy and without blame. We are called with a holy calling, called by the love we bear to Christ, to the souls of our fellow-men and to our own immortal interests, to beware of every thing that might blemish our profession, obscure the lustre of divine grace, or hinder our walking in God's commandments or the keeping of his statutes and the doing them.

Nor is this an unreasonable requirement. The law of perfection was the law under which man was originally created; and in creating him anew in Christ Jesus, God necessarily placed him under the operation of a perfect law, the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. He is consequently our law. We live only, as we live in him; we are sanctified only as he lives in us and we make sure and certain progress as both combine. "Abide in me and I in you. He that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit."

We are not, however, required to do impossibilities, but only to serve God according to the grace given unto us, to devote every power, faculty and talent which we now have or may receive, to his service. Religion and the ordinary details of life's work, are not to be kept separate; on the contrary, they must go together, the former giving dignity and importance to the latter, and sweetening life's toils and cares, which would otherwise be oppressive. We can cultivate the spirit and temper of our great exemplar, we can imitate him, not only in his meekness, patience, gentleness and other passive virtues, but also in his active works of charity and self-denying beneficence. We can follow Christ, if not always with a firm, steady step, yet with the cry of the woman of Canaan, "Lord help me;" and we can never cry to him in vain; for he hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee."

Moreover, it is the universal conviction that the life of Christ is the very best that could be lived. We then, who are professedly his followers, have no right to attempt to live otherwise. The desire of perfection is also an essential element of Christian character. The disciple wishes to be as

his Lord, and his great consolation now is, that "when He shall appear, he will be like Him, for he shall see him as He is." To cease, therefore, to desire and aim at conformity to Christ, is to cease to live. For he is our life. The Christianity of many is momentary, like the evanescent brilliancy of an April morning, because its principle is momentary; they turn to religion to diversify life, not to be their life and consequently it is to them but a form, a fashion, whereas its very being is inward and practical; it is not the likeness of a living reality; it is life, the life of God in a human soul. But this life, whether in the fountain or in the stream, must follow the same general law of development. The disciple will endeavor to be as his Lord and the servant as his Master. To be like him will, consequently, be the great aim and purpose of his life. It is his sober and settled conviction, that in this way only can he attain the end, for which he has been called out of darkness into marvellous light.

But how does the example of Jesus bind us to live? Even as he also lived. And how did he live? We have already seen, in a manner so different from the common practice of the world, that his whole life was in direct opposition to it. Pleasure, lust, pride, avarice and ambition have ever characterized the world of mankind; but in opposition to all this, He came to establish a kingdom, spiritual and holy in its nature, and eternal in its duration. The members of this kingdom must be in full harmony with it; they could not belong to both, at the same time, since they are in irreconcilable opposition. In the world around them they beheld lust and sensuality in their varied forms; but they were to follow him who was meek and lowly in heart, holy, harmless and separate from sinners. There they saw pride and arrogance; but they were to follow him who had not where to lay his head and who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister; there was selfishness, but they were to follow Him, who having devoted his days to works of mercy, gave his life a ransom for many. In short, the life of Christ was not the development of any one truth, but the manifestation of all truth, in perfect harmony; nor was it the development of any single virtue, but a perfect union of all virtues, a glorious combination of whatsoever things are true, pure, just, honest and of good report. In him we see faith, corresponding to the devotion which it nourished, and benevolence wide as the universe which pours its blessings, like the rain, upon

the evil and the good. In him we see a fortitude, which nothing could appal, a patience that endured every form of insult and injury and a submission that bowed to the divine will without a murmur, in the garden and on the cross. Here then is our model, on which we may meditate to ascertain the distance, which separates us from it; our life, in which we must live and which must live in us, before we can conquer the world of lust and passion. We must be united to Jesus, as the branch is united to the vine, and the life which we now live in the flesh must be by the faith of the Son of God. Where this inward union exists, there will be outward conformity; there will be an intense desire to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit and to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord. We are called to faith in Christ and fellowship with Christ, in order that we may become holy. This is the end of our faith and in so far as we attain this end we are Christians and no farther. The same mind must be in us which was also in Christ Jesus. The same emotion that rested on him must rest upon us; and the life of faith will then be accompanied by the life of holiness, a life of inward devotion and outward activity and zeal. The man, who thus puts on the Lord Jesus, shall not walk in darkness but will have the light of life. His path will grow brighter and brighter, until the day dawns and the sun, which never sets, shines in its splendor upon a ransomed Church and a rejoicing world.

But here we must close our brief and imperfect paper. It is far from being what we desired it to be. Though fully up to the measure of our knowledge of Christ, it falls, infinitely, far short of the dignity and worth of him, who is the subject of it. If however, it shall lead some suffering soul to look unto the Son of God for comfort and consolation, or induce any that are far off to draw nearer to him, our labor will not have been in vain. The attacks of unbelievers, in modern times, have only led us to cling more closely to the crucified; and, though, we know not what form unbelief will next assume, we are certain, that the Christ of History will remain the Rock, on which, weary souls will ever rest and draw from its cleft-side, purifying and refreshing waters. "His story will draw forth tears without end; his sufferings melt the noblest hearts," and all generations shall call Him blessed.

## ARTICLE V.

## THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG.

By Prof. M. Jacobs, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.      \*

It is not surprising, that the whole country should manifest a lively and an abiding interest in that Battle, which has given Gettysburg a place in history. Its results are of a character too important to the nation and to unborn millions, to be a matter of superficial concern. Without doubt, it formed the critical point of the war of this unnatural and atrocious Rebellion. The intense anxiety, in regard to the result, which filled the public mind, when the first confused rumors of the battle were spread abroad, was equalled only by the fullness of joy felt, when the news of its glorious termination were flashed on the wiles to the North, the East and the West. Had it resulted differently from what it did: had it turned out according to the frequent beatings and the confident expectations of the enemy, in the cutting up of the different Corps of our army in detail, and the eventual destruction of that army, the whole land would have been filled with mourning and consternation. Such deeds would have been perpetrated by the Rebel hordes, as would have been felt, in their disastrous consequences, for generations to come; and such a blow would have been struck at the heart of the nation, as might have proved fatal to the integrity and future existence of our most excellent government. In two or three days, the enemy would have held high carnival in the Monumental City, where, on the 19th of April, 1861, when the future was dark, and dismay rested on the countenances of loyal men, the first patriot blood was shed by an armed mob whose leaders were in the interest of treason; and Washington, the Capital of the nation, would either have been sacked and burned, or held as the seat of power, from which to send forth over the land the baleful influences of oppression and despotism.

It is for such reasons, that the Editor of this Quarterly, published on the ground made sacred by the blood of patriots fallen in the battle of Freedom, has deemed to furnish its readers with a condensed account of these great



events which transpired at Gettysburg on the first days of July 1863.

Gettysburg is located in a broad irregular valley, situated between two ridges of moderate elevation. These ridges, and others parallel to them and to the South Mountain, owe their existence to the hard rock, which forms their central axes. When the force, which tilted and folded the strata which constitute the South Mountain, operated along the Atlantic coast, it produced rents in the superficial red shade rock, varying from 40 feet to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles wide, and extending parallel to the mountain. These rents or fissures, reaching down to the fused masses beneath, were filled with that material, rising up, as water does between two separate masses of ice, which, on being cooled, formed Greenstone, or Trap rock, as Geologists call it. This rock, being much harder than the red shade lying in the intermediate spaces, was worn away but slightly when the great water currents, driven parallel with the mountain, scooped out the softer slate into valleys and plains. Each ridge has, therefore, a central mass of Trap rock, which defied the wearing action of the storms and waves of the ancient Ocean. The ridges between Gettysburg and the mountain are nearly straight, and parallel to each other; whilst immediately to the East and South of the town lies a belt of Trap,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles wide, giving greater variety to the scenery, and presenting several irregular lines of abrupt hills; the softer portions of the rock having been easily worn away, whilst the harder yet remain, standing out from the face of the country. Such are Cemetery Hill, Culp's Hill, Wolf Hill, and the Round Tops. The ridge to the North West of Gettysburg and designated Seminary Ridge, is a long narrow elevation.

The fragments of Trap rock, which are to be found in convenient abundance on the tops and sides of these ridges, have in most places been gathered and put together by the farmers and built up into stone fences. These fences, where they were found in a proper position, were used by the two armies as breast-works, and where this was not the case, they were changed, or others erected in the requisite positions.

The area, occupied as the battle-field, is about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles long from North to South, and about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  wide from East to West. The first day's fight took place to the North West of the town. When the battle began, the *Rebels* were posted on a ridge about 2 miles to the N. W. of Gettysburg.



and half a mile from Willoughby's Run; and the Union advance on McPherson's ridge, the next adjacent to the Seminary Ridge, and immediately West of it. On the second and third days, the Rebels occupied the Seminary Ridge as their rear line on the West, and an interior curved line, extending from the Hagerstown Road, where it crosses Seminary Ridge, Eastward through Middle Street, and thence bending in a South Eastern direction across Rock Creek.

On these two days, the *Union* forces were posted on a line extending from Cemetery Hill, Southward to Round Top, and on another extending South Eastward to Culp's Hill and Rock Creek, these two lines forming the two sides of a triangle having its apex turned towards the town. The reader may consult, with advantage, the map accompanying the "*Notes on the Rebel Invasion and the Battle of Gettysburg,*" published by Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

Until within some days previous to the close of June, very few, if any, of our citizens apprehended a bloody conflict in our vicinity. We had been apprised of Gen. Lee's intention of invading the North; to gain supplies, to produce a diversion in favor and in the interests of the Rebellion; and to compel, if possible, a peace upon his own terms. We had watched his progress towards the Potomac, and noticed with no little concern the arrival of the several Corps of his great army on this side of that river. But most persons supposed that, however tempting the rich farms and storehouses of Pennsylvania might appear to him to be, he would not deem it safe to venture so far from his base of support and supply as to cross into the borders of our State. It did not, therefore, seem probable, that if there should be a battle on this side of the Potomac, it would take place as far North as it did. But as the month of June hastened to a conclusion, and the movements of the enemy brought them to the North and North East of us, and our own army hastened in pursuit, the hearts of many began to be filled with anxieties and fears. From the position into which the two armies were falling, they could not help believing that a collision must take place somewhere in the county of Adams or that of York. It became apparent that the tendency of the Rebels towards the Susquehanna was either a hint to conceal some ulterior design, or that it was suddenly checked by the appearance of extensive warlike preparation, which were being made on the Eastern side of the river, and that,

therefore, they were turning aside in some other direction. It did not require a long time to discover, that that direction was towards Baltimore and Washington. From the positions of the two armies; from the fact that all the roads from all the surrounding country converge in the town of Gettysburg; and from the known intention of the Rebels to seize and occupy Baltimore, both on its own account and on account of its being the key to the National Capital, it became every day more and more probable, that the storm of war would burst over our heads.

These fears were strengthened by such facts as these: When the Rebels had reached Carlisle and Mechanicsburg, in the lower end of the Cumberland Valley, and Wrightsville and Columbia on the Susquehanna, they began to move backward again; whilst those who had not proceeded farther than Chambersburg, turned South Eastward to Fayetteville and Cashtown. On Sunday the 23rd of June, just two days after the raid of Gordon's Brigade of Early's Division of Ewell's Corps had been made through our town, and for a deliverance from which we had heartily thanked God, the camp fires of the advance of A. P. Hill's Corps were seen blazing on the hills in the rear of Cashtown; thus shewing that we still lay in their track. On Monday, by aid of a perspective glass, we could discover large numbers of tents and wagons, and at night the camp fires of the enemy had become more numerous. On Tuesday the whole of Heath's Division of Hill's Corps advanced to the Seminary Ridge, one half a mile West of Gettysburg, bringing their wagons and artillery with them, prepared to occupy our town and the surrounding hills, as an advance position on their way to Baltimore. They halted their front on the top of that Ridge, throwing out their pickets before them, and their officers spent about one hour in looking around. We saw them then turn back again, probably to await the arrival of a stronger force, for they had ascertained that they might possibly meet with some resistance. Pettigrew, who was the leader of this advance, withdrew his troops to a safe distance that night. Early's Division, which had paid us the visit of Friday the 26th, was converging towards those of Rhodes and Johnston, the rest of Ewell's Corps, and had, on its return, reached the vicinity of Hampton, about 12 miles East of Gettysburg on Tuesday night, whilst Rhodes' Division had reached Huddersburg, 9 miles North East of Gettysburg, and Johnston's was yet in the

vicinity of Carlisle. These things showed, either that the Rebels designed concentrating their forces upon our town, or that they purposed moving in concert on two roads, the Chambersburg and Carlisle turnpikes, and converging at some point below Gettysburg, in the direction of Baltimore. Of course they were calculating upon the contingency of meeting resistance some where on their way; Hill's and Ewell's Corps being in the advance, and Longstreet's in the rear, on the Chambersburg turnpike, and all within supporting distance of each other.

In the meanwhile we had learned, that our forces, under General Hooker, were, by rapid marches, following on the flank of the enemy, on the Eastern side of the South Mountain; the left being at Frederick City, on Sunday the 28th, and the right near New Windsor, in Carroll County, Md. On Sunday also, a Brigade of cavalry, under General Copeland, reached our town, amidst the rejoicings of the people, who regarded them as the blessed harbingers of our approaching army. Having made the intended reconnaissance, General Copeland returned on Monday morning towards Littlestown for further duty. On Monday evening, the 1st, 11th and 3rd Corps under Gen. Reynolds reached Emmittsburg, and on Tuesday, the 1st and 11th were advanced as far as the right bank of Marsh Creek,  $6\frac{1}{2}$  miles South of Gettysburg, the 1st Division of the 1st Corps under Gen. Wadsworth crossing to the Eastern side and resting nearer Gettysburg, whilst the 3rd Corps remained near Emmittsburg, covering the rear and bringing on the reserve artillery and supply train. At noon, on Tuesday, just one hour after the rebels under Pettigrew had retired from the Seminary Ridge towards Cashtown, General Buford, whose early death the nation now most sincerely mourns, moved through our town, with about 20,000 cavalry, a portion of whom he stationed on the Mummasburg road  $\frac{1}{2}$  of a mile north of the College, whilst the larger portion of them he advanced  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a mile to the North-west of the town, on Hon. E. McPherson's farm. On Tuesday night, whilst we lay down to sleep as usual, there were not less than 78,000 men within 12 miles around us, ready, on the morrow, to enter into deadly conflict with each other, and to stain our green fields with the blood of the wounded and slain; and within less than 30 miles of us there were nearly 200,000 men prepared to enter the fearful contest for victory or death.

Wednesday, July 1st. Wednesday morning dawned, but not without a cloud. Heavy vapors, threatening rain, filled the sky and covered the earth with their thick shadows. The hurried movements of horsemen during the early morning, and the careful examination of the surrounding hills by signal officers indicated that preparations for a great struggle were going on. Citizens were moving to and fro in painful expectation, or gathered in clusters on the streets, discussing the probabilities of a hostile meeting. At length, at 9½ A. M., the dreadful suspense was relieved by the booming of cannon and the bursting of a shell. The battle had begun. Heath's division had been brought forward from their camping ground of the night, to the first hill west of Wiloughby Run, and had sent a defiant shell amongst Buford's men, who were posted on the opposite side of Wiloughby Run, and  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a mile distant. Buford's men proudly answered the defiant missile, and alone for nearly an hour, gallantly resisted the attack of the enemy. Soon after 10 A. M., General Reynolds hurried through town and inquired for General Buford; the 1st Corps, under Wadsworth, Robinson and Doubleday, in the meanwhile, moving rapidly from the Emmitsburg road, in a living stream, under cover of the Seminary Ridge, and in front of McMillan's, the Seminary and Dr. Krauth's, and forming, went over the crest of the ridge to relieve Buford and to meet the advancing enemy. The cavalry now gradually retired to the rear and flanks, leaving the 1st Corps, for the next two hours, to stand alone in the fight. Never did troops behave with more gallantry, never did men fight more as if they felt that the honor and the very existence of their country depended upon the manner, in which they then acquitted themselves. The living masses, as seen by us, swayed backward and forward; our left more constantly maintaining its ground and advancing upon the enemy, whilst the right, which was weaker, and opposed to a heavy hostile force, was more frequently forced to retire, and move under the shelter of a small wood. During the earlier hours of the fight, success was mostly on our side. It was indeed a hard-fought battle, considering the proportion of numbers, which was about two of the enemy to one of ours. Many of our noble boys fell wounded and dead on that bloody field, but so also did there of theirs. They took quite a number of our men prisoners, but were not able to hold them; for they were re-taken; but those we took, from them were held, and sent to the rear. Of Davis' Mississippi Bri-



gade, belonging to Heath's division, which was very badly cut up, 800 prisoners were taken, and of Archer's Brigade of the same division about 1500. The latter capture took place early in the day, and the brave and lamented Reynolds lived just long enough to see it accomplished. Archer was trying to drive out of McPherson's woods the left of the 2nd Brigade of the 1st Division of the 1st Corps, which had just gained that position from the Rebels, and, as he moved up, the Iron Brigade, the 1st of the same Division, was swung around so as to bring Archer between our lines, and thus temporarily to surround him. Seeing this, he surrendered with his men, to Major Riddle, who, together with Capt. Wadsworth, both of Reynolds' Staff, had executed this successful movement. It was almost at this moment, so exciting and auspicious, that the gallant General fell. He had gone into the woods to urge on the men who were driving back the Rebel lines, and, seeing that they were successful, he was coming out again. Being at the outer edge of the woods the fatal volley was fired, which killed him and wounded a number of his escort. Thus in the moment of gain we sustained a heavy loss.

Although much beloved and highly appreciated in the army, where he was best known, there is reason to believe that his worth as an officer has not been appreciated by his country, in whose sacred cause he so gloriously fought and fell. He had been severely, though unjustly censured for precipitating the battle of the 1st day. He had but one alternative either to fight and to try to hold the enemy in check until the whole army might come up, or to retreat and yield a most important position into their possession. He chose the former. The battle had begun—it was unavoidable—when he reached the ground. He had been informed of the value of the position South of the town. He saw the importance of holding the town, and of preventing the enemy from entrenching themselves in it. He, therefore, apprised Gen. Meade, that he would hold the enemy at bay, and fight from house to house, if necessary, until the balance of the army would come up. In this he was likely to succeed when he was suddenly cut down. And although others after him did well and fought nobly, it is believed, by those who knew him best, that had he lived to see the end of the day, he would, to say the least, have rendered the results of the day more auspicious to us than they were.



But obstinate as was the resistance of the brave 8,000 men of the 1st Corps, against the 22,000 of Heath and Pender of Hill's Corps, it gradually became evident that in this unequal contest our men must at last yield, if not soon relieved or supported. The left was just holding its own, and the right was being pushed farther and farther back. Very opportunely, therefore, at 11½ o'clock, two Divisions of the 11th Corps, under Generals Barlow and Schurz, arrived on the field and took position on the right of the 1st, whilst the 2nd Division under Gen. Steinwehr, in accordance with the wishes of Gen. Reynolds, and by direction of Gen. Howard, upon whom now devolved the command of the field, moved at once to the Cemetery Hill, and prepared to hold it in possession. Our right, being thus strengthened, gave evidence of new vigor.

But it was not long before the enemy was also strongly reinforced. The two Divisions of Ewell's Corps, viz: Rhodes', which had lodged the previous night near Heidlersburg, and Early's, which had lodged near Hampton, having come within two miles of the battle field before noon, and rested, came in by the Harrisburg and York roads, and flanked our right. An unequal contest of 22,000 against more than 40,000 was now maintained for a while. But our right, being hard pressed and flanked, was obliged to yield, and then also our left. At about 3¼ P. M., Gen. Howard ordered his troops to fall back to the Cemetery Hill, where he had made preparations to make a new stand by the sending thither of Gen. Steinwehr and a strong artillery force. The 1st Corps, retired across the fields and lots of the South Western section of the town, and, for the most part, successfully and in good order, reached the hill; the 11th Corps, retreated through the town, but being very much crowded and hotly pursued by the enemy, were less successful. Amidst the confusion, about 2,500 of them were taken prisoners: but the rest fell in again, in good order, when they reached the hill, where preparations had been made to receive and check the enemy. Elated with success the enemy pressed onward towards the eastern flank of the hill, where being subject to a raking fire from our men they stopped, and ceased to fight for that evening.

As we saw our men crowded in our street, apparently uncertain in which way they might most quickly escape their pursuers, who called to each other, "Shoot them down, shoot

them down," whilst the sharp crack of Rebel rifles was heard in rapid succession and our men were falling wounded and dead, our hearts sank within us. And as we, soon afterwards, saw crowds of our men going to the rear as prisoners, our discouragement became still greater. We were almost ready to give up all hope. Besides, as if all this, were not enough, the enemy, who at 4 P. M., crowded our street and began to prepare to cook their supper and to lie on our side walks for the night, gathered around our door, and to demand entrance. Then began a search for "Yankee soldiers." Three of these had, just a few moments before, gone into our cellar. An entrance into that cellar was immediately demanded, and so we had no choice but to give them up. The Rebel joy over this day's success was great, and their boasting knew no bounds. Whilst the rank and file showed their appreciation of their success by asking us, "How do you like the war now?" the officers, many of whom were intelligent and polite gentlemen, exhibited theirs, by striving to get us into conversation; by telling us that they had beaten us at Chancellorsville; that they had beaten us on this day, and would take the balance of the army on the morrow; that they had no intention of going to Harrisburg and East of the Susquehanna, but had other designs in view, which they were now accomplishing—the cutting up of our army in detail, of then going to Baltimore and Washington, and thus conquering a peace. There was joy throughout the whole Rebel ranks that night, whilst sorrow filled the hearts of the citizens, and anxiety and fear many of the men of our army; for no one knew what the morrow would bring forth.

The following night was one of preparation. The two armies were being brought together for the bloody work of the succeeding day. The peaceful full moon looked down through the thin canopy of cloud, affording her light as cheerfully as if the hurried movements were all made to save, instead of to destroy life. Anderson's, the remaining Division of Hill's Corps, and McLaws' and Hood's Divisions of Longstreet's Corps arrived at the scene of action and were put in position on the right wing of the enemy; and Johnston's, arriving next morning, was placed on the extreme left of Ewell's Corps which occupied the town and the line East of it.

On Cemetery Hill the 11th Corps, under Gen. Howard occupied the centre, in the order of 1st, Ames Barlow, (2d,

Steinwehr, (3), Schurz ; of the 1st Corps, the 1st Division of Wadsworth was placed on the right of the 11th, near Culp's Hill, the 2nd of Robinson to the left of the 11th, and the 3rd of Doubleday to the left and front of Robinson. About the time when the retreat to Cemetery Hill began, Gen. Hancock arrived to represent Gen. Meade on the field instead of Reynolds, who had fallen. At 7, P. M., Gen. Slocum came with the 12th Corps, and was placed on our extreme right, Gen. Geary occupying Culp's Hill with Greene's and Kane's Brigades ; and Gen. Williams the line near Spangler's Spring, with Ruger's and Lockwood's Brigades, Gen. Knipe's probably occupying the adjacent parts of Wolf Hill. Gen. Sickles came about the same hour, with most of the 3rd Corps, a part having been left with the supply train. He took position on our left, next to Doubleday, and near the Emmittsburg Road. At 11, P. M., Gen. Meade left Taneytown, and arrived at the field, at 1 o'clock, A. M. At 7, A. M., of the 2nd, the 2nd Corps, under Gen. Hancock, the 5th, under Gen. Sykes, and the rest of the 3rd, with the reserve artillery arrived. The 2nd Corps took the place of the 3rd, which was now ordered to take a position farther to the left ; whilst the 5th was kept in reserve until the arrival of the 6th, at 2, P. M., from East Berlin, having marched 22 miles since 2, A. M. of Wednesday, the day previous. The 5th, under Sykes, were then assigned to the extreme left, having been joined by the Pennsylvania Reserves at 5, P. M. In making these dispositions, in placing the artillery in position and in constructing the breastworks on the right of our line (Culp's Hill), the morning of the day passed away. The picket firing and skirmishing which occurred through the day were attended with no decided results.

At 20 minutes past 4, P. M., however, the work of death began with terrible earnestness. Gen. Sickles, in removing towards the left to give place to Hancock, instead of making the line extend directly from our left centre towards Round Top, as Gen. Meade had designed, extended it along the Emmittsburg Road, which he had held by his pickets. This advanced position exposed him especially to the assaults of the enemy. At the hour assigned, the Rebels opened upon him, in front and on his flank, with a terrific artillery fire, vigorously supported by large bodies of infantry. The enemy advanced his artillery rapidly from point to point until he had driven our columns nearly

back to our original line. The 3rd Corps resisted the shock gallantly. Driven back, it was rallied in person by Gen. Sickles, who was, however, wounded so severely as to be carried from the field and to render the amputation of a limb necessary. But notwithstanding the desperate valor of the men of the 3rd Corps, they were not able, of themselves, to sustain the fierce attacks of McLaws' and Anderson's Divisions. The guns of Bigelow's battery, which had been sent forward towards Sherfy's peach orchard, in the vicinity of which and on Rose's farm there was the most obstinate and destructive fighting, were, at one time, near all captured by the enemy, but fortunately retaken by our men. Gen. Meade ordered a portion of Hancock's Corps to support Sickles on his right, Sykes on the extreme left, and part of the 6th in his front, and also several Brigades, particularly Lockwood's Maryland Brigade to move over from the right. The Rebels had now thrown Hood's Division on their extreme right into the dreadful struggle. The desperate contest had lasted about two hours; Gen. Barksdale, whilst urging on his men opposite to Hancock's left, calling to them most fiercely "Advance, advance," was shot down, and his command driven back; Hood's men had been thrown furiously, upon Barnes' Division stationed between Little Round Top and Round Top, and though driven back with great slaughter, a fresh portion was thrown forward in their stead, with the view of taking that key to our position; and our men now in danger of being overcome by this new mass of the enemy, were looking for support from Gen. Sykes. The Pennsylvania Reserves had as yet not been brought into action. They were placed to the right of Little Round Top, near the cross road leading from the Taneytown to the Emmittsburg roads. Gen. Crawford had been ordered to send Col. Fisher to the aid of the Brigade of Barnes between the Round Tops. The battle was raging furiously in front. Scarcely had Col. Fisher reached the required position, when Gen. Sickles' men broke and retreated, the division of the 5th, by which he was supported, having been out-flanked. The space in front of Crawford's men was filled with flying men, and fragments of regiments, escaping through his men to the rear. Having placed his men consisting of one Brigade and part of another in two ranks, he ordered them to fire two well directed volleys into the mass of approaching Rebels, who were coming in solid column towards that portion of our lines. Taking the colors of the leading regiment



into his hand, he rode in front of his men, and ordered them to a charge! With a terrific shout they rushed forward, and drove the panic-stricken rebels over the marshy ground in front of Little Round Top, up the adjacent hill to a stone fence for which there was a short struggle, and then through the woods and wheat field to a ridge beyond. Whilst Gen. Crawford was preparing to remove and care for the wounded, Col. Fisher informed him that Round Top was yet in possession of the Rebels and that Col. Rice of Barnes' Brigade desired to co-operate in taking it. Gen. Crawford ordered it to be taken, and it was done without the firing of a gun.

Thus, with the charge of the Pennsylvania Reserves, ended the fight of this day on our left. It occurred at the critical moment, and with its successful issue, the tide of battle was turned against the Rebels. Little Round Top was safe; and the day was ours. The rout of the Rebels in this charge caused them to retire on other parts of the line, and thus relieved Col. Fisher and Col. Rice between the two Round Tops. Gen. Crawford rested at the stone wall for the night, and threw out his pickets beyond the woods. The Pennsylvania Reserves fortified the Round Tops; and additional artillery was placed on Little Round Top—a natural fortress.

Never, perhaps, was a battle fought with more desperate bravery and obstinacy than that of this afternoon. Both Rebels and our own men, felt as if every thing depended upon the issue of this afternoon. The former had come a great distance, confident of gaining a glorious victory; the latter, many of whom were on their native soil and in sight of their homes, felt as if they were fighting for themselves and friends, and for the honor of their country. Stained with blood, and covered with the wounded and dead, the fields attested the fury of the fight. Of our men many fell, but far more of the Rebels. The wheat field presented a sorrowful spectacle of the Rebel dead. About 1,500 of these were buried within a short compass, on Rose's farm.

During this afternoon Gen. Zook was killed and Sickles wounded. The brave and good Gen. Vincent fell between the two Round Tops; Gen. Weed was mortally wounded near the left crest of Little Round Top, and Lieut. Hazlitt commanding a battery, on its summit going to his aid, was killed by a bullet and, as he was endeavoring to hear his last words, fell dead into the dying General's arms. Thus two



kindred spirits left the world together, whilst paying and receiving the tokens of deep affection.

The battle had closed, on our left, at the setting of the sun. Scarcely however had it ended here, when it raged with fury on our right. Ewell had sworn that he would take the hills on our Eastern line. The first task was to take the batteries on the Eastern flank of Cemetery Hill. The fearful task was committed to the Louisiana Brigade (Tigers) with proper supports. The assault was made. Coming by an oblique movement, over a hill behind which they had formed, up to the stone fence in front of our men, they endeavored to secure it. Some succeeded in crossing and coming up to our guns, and seizing hold cried, "Surrender," but were beaten off by the gunners with clubs and stones. They were driven back with fearful slaughter; they confessed afterwards that in this assault they lost more than half their men. In the meantime the incessant and loud roar of rifles and muskets indicated that a furious contest was going on, on the Eastern flank of Culp's Hill. A desperate assault was there made, upon our works, and gallantly met by a portion of Gen. Geary's command, a portion having been sent during the afternoon, to the support of Sickles but had not yet returned. The Rebels succeeded in crossing our breast-works where they were left comparatively undefended, and, at 9<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> P. M., had come within several hundred yards of the Baltimore turnpike. They were prevented from progressing farther, by the lateness of the hour, by the uncertainties of receiving support in the heart of an enemy's lines, and by the return of our men from the left. Both their men and ours lay down and rested on their arms. During the night, the Rebels were heavily reinforced by five regiments of Rhodes' Division, whom we saw marched past our door. On our side, the 12th Corps had all returned, including Lockwood's Maryland Brigade, and Shaler's or Wheaton's of the 6th Corps.

At 4 A. M., as soon as the morning dawned, the fight was renewed. Our artillery, from Best's battery, opened with telling effect upon the enemy. A battery planted on Power's Hill did good execution. At sun-rise, the infantry were engaged; and by 10 A. M. the Rebels were driven back, beaten, and slaughtered in vast numbers. In front of our works and where they were driven back over them, they lay in heaps. The scarred timber and the riven tree-tops still remain to attest the terrible earnestness with which our men

fought, and their determination to drive back the enemy where he had broken into our lines. Our men must have rained a perfect storm of lead and shell amongst them, for nearly all the scarring of trees was done on the side facing the position occupied by our men.

In this terrible fight, friend met friend, and neighbor met neighbor. General Stuart's Brigade of Johnston's division, composed mostly of Marylanders, was, for a while, opposed to Lockwood's Maryland Brigade; and, the two 1st Maryland Regiments, Rebel and Union, confronted each other. Afterwards such a change was made in the disposition of forces as brought Stuart in front of Kane's Brigade of Geary's division of the 12th Corps. In the charge upon our breastworks, Stuart's Brigade lost, according to the testimony of an intelligent man of that Brigade, with whom we afterwards conversed, 1500 out of 2200 men! The 1st Maryland (Rebel) charged against the 5th Ohio, and lost 400 men. The charge was undertaken, although against the earnest protest of General Stuart. The protest was heard by our informant, who was only several feet from Stuart. In this charge, a North Carolina Regiment broke at the first fire.

Thus Ewell's efforts to break our right flank and hold those hills turned out a sad failure; and with it ended all fighting on our right. The Rebels were too badly broken and weakened to make any further efforts there. From 11, A. M., to 1, P. M., there was a lull in the storm of war.

During all the morning hours and those of the middle of Friday, the 3rd, General Lee was busily engaged planning a final attack upon our left. Unsuccessful in his attempt to gain our extreme left or right, he now determined to make one great effort to break our centre. He selected our left centre, occupied by the 2nd Corps, as the most assailable point — the point where no obstacles were presented by the nature of the ground, and where an assault must be resisted mainly by pure skill and valor.

At 7 minutes past 1, P. M. the ominous silence of two hours was broken by the opening of a cannonade from about 125 heavy Rebel guns, and responded to by as many on our side. The cannonade, was the most terrific of the War, perhaps the most so, ever heard by mortal man. Seminary Ridge, from the extreme Rebel right to beyond McClean's, was one blaze of fire; and this line was continued Eastward, at favorable points, to the extreme Rebel left; subjecting our guns and men to converging rays of shot and shell,

which flew through the air, whizzing, screaming and exploding. Nor were ours silent. Gun replied to gun, thunder answered thunder, shell met flying shell, bursting and dealing death whithersoever sent. First, the cannon belched forth fire and smoke, then, was seen in mid air a flash, a little cloud, and then the dreadful result for which the missile was sent—dead men, horses, and broken guns and caissons, mingled in confusion! Happily for our men, many of the rebel shells failed to explode, and to fulfil the errand of destruction upon which they had been sent. Especially did those, which the cupidity of our English cousins furnished to the enemies of our country, prove far less destructive than they were intended to be.

At about 3, P. M., the firing became less active, especially on our part, whether because the guns had to be cooled, or because it was deemed a useless expenditure of ammunition we are not able to state; but at this time the rebel infantry was called into action. To Pickett's Division of Longstreet's Corps was mainly committed the perilous task of breaking our lines. In this undertaking he was encouraged by the belief that our batteries, which had ceased firing, had been disabled. Pickett's Division, having arrived late in the previous afternoon, had not thus far been called into action, and was therefore fresh and ready. At 3, P. M. the rebel masses were seen emerging from the wooded crest of the Seminary Ridge, in two dense columns, the one in the rear of the other, and moving forward in the direction of the position, occupied by the 2nd Corps. On the left, this Division was supported by Pettigrew's Brigade of Heath's Division, and on the right by Wilcox and Wright of Anderson's Division. Hancock's Corps, which was to sustain the shock, of battle, was supported by Doubleday's Division of the 1st Corps, and Stannard's Vermont Brigade, attached to the 1st Corps. Our men, during the day, constructed low breast-works of earth and timber, where there was no stone fence in line, and lay down behind them on their faces during a cannonade of two hours, from 75 to 100 guns, the most tremendous of the war. The air was filled with exploding shells, spherical case and grape shot. Our batteries replied vigorously, but their's fired twice to our once.

As the enemy descended the flank of Seminary Ridge, our batteries sent a shell a few feet beyond their column, then one into their midst, and then another directly in front of

them. This caused them to halt for a few moments; and then, with a wild and savage yell, they rushed forward. Their line, at starting, was about a mile long. This was to be converged and thrown upon Hancock's, which was less than one fourth that length. Wilcox and Wright, on the enemy's right, being more distant, must move more rapidly than their left, so as to bring all parts of the moving mass up at nearly the same point and time. When our men discovered them coming, every man sprang to his feet, and the cry ran along the line, "There they come." Both parties had reserved their fire until the enemy reached the Emmitsburg road—200 or 300 yards from our line—and then the deadly aim of our men brought them down by hundreds, covering the ground with the wounded and dead. The left of their column soon began to waver, a few men, perhaps 200, were seen hastening back towards the ridge, several others hurrying to the rear, carrying one battle-flag, and a few officers and men surveying the field with apparent amazement and returning. The tale was told. The great mass of those who had come forward to the attack had been made prisoners or were amongst the wounded and dead. Gen. Gibbons had ordered his men to retire, to enable him to use his artillery, and had received the rebels, who had looked upon this movement as a retreat, with grape and canister. Gen. Webb, seeing them falter, exclaimed, "Boys, the enemy are ours," and his men rushed forward and took 800 prisoners. Farther to their right, they came by an oblique movement opposite to Stannard's Brigade. His 13th and 16th regiments took them on the flank. Their column began to break and scatter, and in three minutes it was an utter rout. Two thirds dropped their arms and came in as prisoners. Opposite the 14th regiment the ground was strewn with the rebel dead. Another rebel column, opposite the 14th regiment, soon came and was likewise captured.

In all, about 3,000 or 4,000 prisoners were taken in this charge, together with a number of battle-flags, and the enemy was utterly broken. On their part it was a most signal failure. By many of their intelligent men it was pronounced a desperate—a fool hardy—attempt. With it ended the fight along our whole line, except opposite Little Round Top. The enemy (Hood's Division) still held a position, just in front of that occupied by Gen. Crawford. Gen. Sykes ordered the latter to dislodge the enemy, which he



did by a second charge, made by the Pennsylvania Reserves, driving them completely back to their entrenchments on Seminary Ridge, recovering one Napoleon gun, and 7,000 small arms, besides taking a number of prisoners, and a battle-flag from a Georgia regiment.

The day had now nearly drawn to a close, and the enemy, beaten and repulsed at every point, began to show signs of uneasiness. They began to send their wounded to the rear, and to prepare for a retreat. Expecting to meet the untrained Pennsylvania Militia, they had met the veteran and unconquerable Army of the Potomac. Expecting to obtain a decisive victory, they sustained a signal defeat. They came defiant and exultant, they went down-cast and humbled.

At 12, P. M., Gen. Lee and staff left his headquarters and reached Fairfield early on the morning of the 4th, on his way to Hagerstown. Ewell's Corps fell back from the town and took their position on Seminary Ridge, at 1 to 3, A. M. of the 4th. Heath's Division, which was so badly cut up on the 1st and 3rd, left the Seminary Ridge, on their retreat, at 9½, A. M., of the same day and, having proceeded 2½ miles, drew up in line of battle awaiting the pursuit of the Union Army. Ambulances, filled with their wounded, were driven hurriedly towards the Cashtown Gap, on the Fayetteville road, and towards that of Monterey, in the direction of Waynesboro'. Their progress was quickened by the exciting words, "Hurry! for the Yankees are coming!" Provision and ammunition wagons were driven off at full speed to avoid being captured. Passing farm houses and mills they seized flour and other provisions, with which they hastened off. The wounded, unable to endure the severe motion of such a hasty ride, were heard groaning and crying for pain, and begging to be left behind. Many such poor fellows were left along the line of their retreat.

To guard against surprise, and the more effectually to resist the apprehended attack of Meade's army, the Seminary Ridge was lined with breastworks and rifle-pits on Saturday, the 4th. On that night and Sunday morning, the balance of the Rebel army was withdrawn as rapidly as possible; and quite a number of prisoners were taken in the vicinity. Kilpatrick's cavalry overtook the Rebel wagon-train of 120 wagons between Monterey and the western base of the Mountain, and captured them, on Sunday morning.



Had our army been in a condition to make a vigorous pursuit of the Rebels, thousands of prisoners could have been taken and the Rebel army seriously crippled before reaching the valley, west of the mountains. But this could not be done, 1st, because our army was much fatigued by heavy marching and by three days severe fighting; and 2ndly, because they were without food. Provisions did not indeed arrive until Sunday afternoon. To us, the citizens of Gettysburg, it was a source of sincere grief that we had not the means of affording relief to our noble boys when they came to us for bread. But at best what could so few citizens (2,500) do for the feeding of so large an army? Most of our flour and bacon had been sent away, in advance of the Rebel raid of the previous Friday. Then they took what they could get; much was given, on Sunday, to Copeland's cavalry; much again to Buford's cavalry on Tuesday; much also, to our hungry men as they passed through town to the battle on Wednesday; and lastly the Rebels, when in possession of our town, robbed us of what they could find. Many families had to live on short allowance for a number of days. Never shall we forget our feelings when we had to tell our hungry, soldiers, "We have nothing to give, our provisions are exhausted." We felt grieved—ashamed—to see the men hungry who had exposed their lives for our safety and that of the country and to be obliged to let them go unfed. But we felt indignant when newspaper scribblers and others, who perhaps never sacrificed one dollar for the good of their country, or gave a penny to feed the hungry and clothe the needy, charged this to our niggardliness. The truth is, that the citizens of Gettysburg, with few exceptions, did what they could. They gave clothing to the wounded; tore up bedding and garments for bandages; gave their jellies, &c., to the hospitals; and threw open their houses, chambers and halls, as hospitals. As if impelled by some strange influence, men and delicate women, who before would have fainted at the sight of blood, found themselves dressing the mangled limbs of the wounded, and ministering to their wants, heedless of fatigue and the need of rest, until worn out, and others going to the gory field, moistening the fevered brow, and giving drink to the thirsty, and receiving as their only reward the gratitude of the dying soldier in the words, "Angel hands! God bless you."

Provisions, however, and other necessities soon began to arrive, when the truth became known. An intelligent and

liberal public promptly and generously sent wagon and car loads to supply the necessities of the hospitals. Baltimore, and Philadelphia and the surrounding towns and country poured forth their bountiful contributions. The hearts of the people were touched; and private individuals and various associations, such as the Christian Commission, the Sanitary Commission, the Patriot Daughters of Lancaster, and the Adams Express Hospital Corps, vied with each other in bringing relief to the thousands, whom the bloody battle of Gettysburg had made sufferers.

Going out over the hard fought field, immediately after the end of the battle, we every where saw the most striking evidences of the severity of that terrible struggle. Shattered trees, perforated houses, fences swept away, trodden-down corn and wheat fields, scattered blankets, coats, knapsacks, scabbards, canteens, muskets, rifles, and hundreds of thousands of minnie balls, shot and shells gave evidence that the storm of war had swept over that field. But still more striking evidences we saw, in the soil stained with human gore; in the 3,000 noble horses whose carcasses met the eye in every direction; and especially in the 8,000 to 9,000 human bodies, dead and mangled, with eyes staring horribly, strewed over the ground, and many of the more than 20,000 wounded of both armies yet remaining in the field.

It is a great satisfaction to know that, although the battle was severe and had cost us much blood and treasure, it had resulted in a great and glorious victory to our arms, and to our cause. We lost, according to Gen. Meade's report, 2,834 killed, 14,709 wounded, 6,643 prisoners, making 23,186; took 14,821 prisoners, 3 guns, 41 standards, and 24,978 small arms. The number of Rebel wounded was not less than 21,000, and killed than 5,000, which, together with prisoners and stragglers, amounted to 40,000. It will thus be perceived that the Rebel loss was nearly double that of ours.

As soon as possible the wounded were gathered from the battle field and cared for. There were more than 20,000 of these in the hospitals at Gettysburg, besides those that had been taken away. Rebel and Union soldiers were, in many cases, laid side by side, and, except in a few instances where the imprudent zeal of sympathizers transcended the bounds of propriety and decency, all received the same attention. We are proud of our Government, and of our fellow country-

men and women, who would not permit even a sworn enemy to suffer, when helpless and in distress; we are proud to know that when the record of this causeless and atrocious rebellion shall go down to future generations, our humanity and our Christianity will not be sullied by the foul charge of permitting those who came to overthrow our government and to desolate our homes to lie, at our door, pining away with hunger, and dying of their neglected wounds. We thank God, that we have no Libby Prison!

The dead, too, as soon as possible, were gathered from the bloody field, and buried in clusters of 5, 10, 50, and 100. Generally Rebel and Union soldiers were buried in separate graves, and suitably marked. But as the dead were scattered by thousands over the field, and the force that could be detailed to do the work of burying was inadequate, many of the bodies were too far advanced in decomposition to admit of removal. These were generally put into a narrow hole dug by their side, and covered up too slightly. In front of Little Round Top there were lying, all summer, the bodies of half a dozen of Hood's men, who must have fallen in the 2nd day's charge on our extreme left, amongst the large rocks, unburied. When found they could not be removed, nor could earth be carried to them to cover them up. They may have crept into these recesses for shelter, or probably to obtain a little water, to quench their thirst, from a little stream that flowed gurgling through those rocks. Humanity weeps over those brave but deluded men who, coming to drive the ploughshare of ruin through the North, laid down their lives in so infamous a cause.

A grateful country is gathering all the Union dead, from the fields and forests of this extensive area, and depositing them in a beautiful National Cemetery. This is a fit tribute to their heroic valor, and bloody sacrifice. About 3,700 will be gathered and thus honorably laid in their common resting place. Those that can be identified are buried with their comrades in arms, by States, and those who cannot be identified are brought together in two clusters, to the right and the left of the semi-circle of graves, and buried as the "unknown dead." No kinsman, or friend or stranger will be able, in future years, to stop by their graves, and shed the tear of affection over them, or admire the heroic deeds of honored names. They will ever remain as the "unknown dead," only recognized as having fallen in that glorious

struggle, which sent defiant treason back again with shame to its native place.

Over the rebel graves, a humane country has heaped fresh earth, so as more securely to cover the remains of humanity there deposited. In the fields and on the hill-side the green grass, or the rank weeds have grown up and almost hidden the spot of the sepulture of some of them. And no doubt, in future time, the farmer's plough will turn up the crumbling bones of many a one, who came from the distant South to win a victory for the Rebellion, and many a Southerner will come to visit that gory field, and grieve with deepest sorrow, that his friend or kinsman fell in the cause of treason.

The Battle of Gettysburg must ever be regarded as the great and decisive battle of this wicked war. Although treason has been met in many a bloody field, and has received many telling blows from the hands of loyal men, it has, after each, raised its boastful front and returned again to the arena of strife, to renew the contest. But at Gettysburg it received a blow, from which it will never recover. The flower of its army was there put to flight; its overwhelming defeat has taken away its prestige; and the confidence of the South in its invincibility is gone. Disheartened and broken the Rebellion can scarcely make more than a show of resistance. The duped, oppressed and down-trodden people welcome the accumulating evidence of the decay of the power of those who have been ruling them with a rod of iron, and rejoice in beholding the dawn of the day of their redemption; when the whole country shall be united again, the old animosity forgotten, a true friendship restored, and peace and prosperity going hand in hand to bless and gladden the people. May those happy days soon come. Let us all, therefore, sincerely and fervently join in the prayer, "that the Union may exist unbroken forever!"

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE CONFESSORS AND THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG.

By REV. F. W. CONRAD, Chambersburg, Pa.

Truth and error are in their essential natures, opposites, and can never be harmoniously united. Hence, whenever they are brought into contact, this opposition will become manifest, and a struggle for the mastery ensue. God is the author of truth; Satan is the originator of error. In heaven, truth reigns, undisturbed by error; in hell, error holds sway, unopposed by truth; on earth truth and error have met in conflict, and are contending for the throne of the world. The contest between them has raged for ages, and as it is one of extermination, it can never cease, until truth or error be vanquished and banished from the earth.

Jesus Christ, the Prince of truth, appeared before Pontius Pilate, one of the princes of error, and witnessed a good confession. He thus became a confessor of the truth, and by necessity a witness against error. As such he became the head of the confessors of truth and of the witnesses against error, and their most illustrious example. That example is clothed with all the authority of positive law, and obligates all who have embraced the truth, and turned away from error, to become like him, confessors of the truth and witnesses against error; and every such confession and testimony will exert its legitimate influence on the final issue of the great contest.

A public confession of the truth may be either ordinary or extraordinary. It is ordinary, when it is made on uniting with the Church by an open profession of faith. It is extraordinary, when crises occur in the conflict between truth and error, calling for a more comprehensive and emphatic statement of the one, and exposure of the other. When Jesus was baptized by John, he made an ordinary confession of the truth; when arraigned before Pontius Pilate, he made an extraordinary one. His disciples had made an ordinary confession of the truth when they became members of his Church; but he announced to them that they would be called upon to make an extraordinary one, before governors and kings. The call to make an ordinary confession



of the truth is universal ; the call to make an extraordinary one is particular. The one is uttered by the words of the Gospel ; the other is communicated by the voice of Providence.

A public confession of the truth may also be either single or united. It is single when one individual makes it ; it is united when numbers are associated in making it. Paul made a single confession when he stood before Agrippa ; the apostles made a united one when, on the day of Pentecost, they testified with one voice, that God had constituted Jesus, who was crucified, both Lord and Christ.

The Reformation was a crisis period in the history of the contest between truth and error. The call was then directed to all, who had made an ordinary and individual confession of the truth, to make an extraordinary and united one. To this call they nobly responded. At their head stands Martin Luther. He made an individual and extraordinary confession of the truth, and gave an emphatic testimony against error, when he nailed the ninety-five theses on the door of the Castle church of Wittenberg, on the 31st of October, A. D., 1517 ; he repeated it, when he burned the Pope's Bull without the gates of the city of Wittenberg, on the 15th of June, A. D., 1521 ; and he reiterated it when he stood before the august Diet of Worms, refusing to recant a single syllable of his writings, and closing his response to the imperial interrogatory in these ever-memorable words : "I cannot recant. It is neither safe nor advisable to do anything against conscience. Here I stand ; I cannot do otherwise. God help me."

Thus far the calls of Providence were addressed to Luther to make an extraordinary confession of the truth singly ; but not long afterwards that same Providence called upon him and his coadjutors to make an extraordinary confession of the truth unitedly. To this call they responded at the Marburg Conference, held October 3rd, A. D., 1529. Their confession of truth was drawn up by Luther himself, and contained fifteen articles of faith. To a similar call they responded at the Swabach Convention, held October 16th, A. D., 1529. The articles of truth, confessed at Marburg, were somewhat modified, increased in number to seventeen, and then re-confessed. And to a similar, though still more emphatic call, they responded at the Diet of Augsburg, held in June, A. D., 1530. The articles of the Confession pre-

pared at Marburg, and amended and extended at Swabach, were still further improved and more largely increased at Augsburg, and then submitted to the learned Melancthon for careful revision. who, after receiving the individual opinions of the princes and theologians, devoted the six weeks, transpiring between the time when the Diet was called to meet and the actual arrival of the Emperor at Augsburg, to this most responsible work. And when at last it came forth in its completed form from his master-hand, it consisted of twenty-eight articles. After the arrival of Charles V., on the 15th of June, A. D., 1530, it was submitted, article by article, to the divines and princes of the Reformation, and received their unanimous approval. It was likewise submitted to Luther, their noble leader, who, for prudential considerations, was left at Coburg, and received his unqualified approbation. It was solemnly signed on the 22nd of June, and ready for public presentation, as the united and authoritative Confession of the Reformers. The day appointed for this purpose was the 25th of June, the hour, 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the place, the palace of the Bishop of Augsburg. The Emperor was in his seat; the princes and theologians of the two great contending parties, numbering over two hundred, filled the hall; a vast multitude stood without, and all things were ready for the delivery of the great Confession.

The Elector, John of Saxony, appointed his Chancellors, Drs. Brück and Baier, to read the Confession; the former in Latin, the latter in German. At the moment when the Emperor signified his readiness to hear it, the Confessors arose, but at his request immediately took their seats again. Drs. Brück and Baier then walked forward into the middle of the hall, each holding a copy of the Confession in his hand. The Emperor then requested the Latin copy to be read first. Instantly the Elector John arose, and reminding him that they were on German soil, requested that the German copy might be read first. To this the Emperor at once assented. After a short introductory speech by Dr. Brück, Dr. Baier read the German copy so loud and distinctly, that every word was not only heard and understood by every one within the palace, but also by the vast multitude, which crowded around the open windows. The reading of the Confession lasted two hours. It was listened to with intense attention, and produced a profound impression. As Dr. Brück handed the two copies of it to the Emperor, he said:

"The Lord Jesus will protect this Confession, and will cause it to remain impregnable against the very gates of hell."

The Confessors of Augsburg, in imitation of the Lord Jesus Christ, witnessed a good confession. They thus became the fathers of the Lutheran Church. As such their memories are cherished by their ecclesiastical children, and their Confession received by all who call themselves Lutherans. And as they occupy the first place among the uninspired confessors of truth, so too does their Confession claim the pre-eminence among all symbols and creeds. To an impartial and unprejudiced consideration of its prominent characteristics, we invite the candid attention of the reader.

I. *The Augsburg Confession is emphatically Protestant.* The term Protestant has an historic origin, from which it derives ecclesiastical significance, and confers religious renown. According to the edict of Worms, passed in 1521, no religious reforms were to be attempted; no innovations tolerated; and no proselytes to Luther made. This constituted an insuperable barrier to the cause of the Reformation. The edict of the first Diet of Spire, held in 1526, repealed it, and granted the liberty to each State, to believe and practice, according to its own views of truth and duty. The barrier of the edict of Worms being thus removed, the cause of the Reformation received a new impetus in its onward progress. In 1529 a second Diet was held in Spire, at which the Emperor Charles V. peremptorily repealed the edict of religious liberty, granted at the first, and thus bound the Reformation again in the iron fetter of religious tyranny.

What was now to be done by the Reformers? There was no other alternative but resistance and protestation, or acquiescence and submission. Acquiescence and submission would involve a violation of the rights of conscience, a loss of personal self-respect, a denial of the truth, as it is in Jesus, and a death-blow to the Reformation. Resistance and protestation would expose them to trials and suffering, to persecution and death. They met for consultation. They deliberated in the fear of God. They came to a conclusion. "Let us reject it," said the Princes, "in matters of conscience, the majority has no power. The Diet is incompetent to do more than to preserve religious liberty, until a general Council meets." This proposition met with a unanimous response, and they determined to *Protest* against the

arbitrary and oppressive decree. They prepared a declaration, embodying their sentiments and resolves, appeared before the Diet, and headed by John, the Elector of Saxony, presented their world-renowned *Protest*. Its conclusion was made in these words: "For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, cousins and friends, we entreat you earnestly to weigh our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, *We Protest* by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer and Saviour, who will one day be our Judge, and before all men and all creatures, that *we*, for us and our people, neither consent nor adhere, in any manner whatsoever, to the proposed decree, in any thing that is contrary to God, to his Holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls, and to the last decree of Spire." Noble Protest! Noble Protestants! For by this significant name, they shall henceforth be known in history, and honored by future generations.

King Ferdinand, brother to the Emperor and President of the Diet, was not present when it was delivered. A deputation of the now Protestant Princes, waited upon him, the next day and presented it to him. He at first received it, but, a moment afterwards, handed it back to them. They refused to take it. Here was now presented one of the sublimest scenes in history. The King afraid to retain the Protest—the Protestants not afraid to decline receiving it. They did, at last, condescend to take it from his hand, and, laying it on the table before him, quitted the hall. There it lay, a silent though terrible witness against ecclesiastical despotism. Unable to bear its presence, he ordered it to be carried out of his sight. But it was too late, and all in vain. Its words had been spoken, and the winds of truth were already wafting them over the earth; the pen of history had recorded them, and her record was already open to the inspection of mankind. The world had heard and read them, and received their indelible impress.

This was the Baptism of the Reformation, at which it received the name of Protestant. It constituted the great Declaration of Religious Independence, by which the Church of Christ declared her right to be free from the religious shackles of the State. Its grand features are, that it exalts the conscience above the civil power in matters of religion, and the Word of God above the authority of Popes and



Councils, in matters of faith. The Augsburg Confession was the full expression and the completed form of this Protest. The rights, denied the Protestants by the Emperor, the Confessors of Augsburg maintained and exercised in the presentation of their Confession. The authority, claimed by the Emperor, they repudiated, and protested against its exercise over them. They affirmed boldly, that the civil and ecclesiastical powers were distinct, and that the former had no right to interfere with, or attempt to control the latter. Indeed, they state in the very preface of their Confession, that they presented it, not only as a Confession of their Faith, but likewise as a Protest against the ecclesiastical usurpations of the Church of Rome. They say: "Since the power of the Church granted eternal things, and is exercised only by the ministrations of the Word, it does not interfere with the civil administration, which is occupied by other things than the Gospel. For the magistrate does not defend minds, but bodies and corporeal things against manifest injuries, and restrains men with the sword and corporeal punishment, for the maintenance of peace and justice. Therefore, the power of the Church and the civil power should not be mixed and confounded with each other. The ecclesiastical has its own command to teach the Gospel and administer the sacraments. Let it not, therefore, break into another's office—let it not transfer the kingdoms of the world—let it not abrogate the laws of princes—let it not take away lawful obedience—let it not interrupt judgment, in any civil ordinances and contracts—let it not prescribe laws to the Governor concerning the laws of the Commonwealth—since Christ has said, "My kingdom is not of this world." They further declare, that if the civil power should overleap its prescribed limits, usurp ecclesiastical powers, and assume the prerogative of prescribing in matters which pertain to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church and the conscience, its authority must be denied, its exercise resisted, and God obeyed rather than man. While, therefore, each of the different Confessions, which were originated and adopted during the age, and in the different lands of the Reformation, may be called a Protestant Confession, we claim, that the Confession of Augsburg, in view of the time when it was prepared, the circumstances under which it was prepared, the form which it assumed, the extent of its reception, the influence it exerted upon the Reformation, and the relation



it bore to Protestantism, deserves to be characterized as emphatically the Protestant Confession.

II. *The Augsburg Confession is thoroughly reformatory.* A moral reformation presupposes a moral corruption. Such a corruption had taken place in the Church of Rome. It was of long standing, dating its origin back more than a thousand years. It was general, embracing doctrine and worship, government and morals. It was almost universal, stamping its impress upon the popes and cardinals, the priest and the laity. It had worn its channels deep and broad, and, increasing constantly in volume, eventually overflowed its banks, and inundated all lands. It had reached its acme, and become intolerable. Its existence had been acknowledged, and its pernicious influence felt and lamented for ages. The remnant of God's elect, such as Wickliffe, Huss and Jerome, had testified against it, confessed the truth, and raised their voices in favor of reforms, but they had sealed their testimony with their blood. The most candid, among the Romanists themselves, acknowledged the existence of this corruption, and realized the importance of inaugurating measures of reform.

Luther and his coadjutors aimed, at first, to bring about a reformation in the Catholic Church itself, but the Providence of God soon taught them its utter impossibility in an organization, which claimed infallibility, as one of its cardinal dogmas. Accordingly, all hope of affecting a reform in the Church of Rome was abandoned, and the determination formed to organize the Evangelical Church, as indispensable to a real, thorough, and permanent reformation. This determination was eventually carried out at Augsburg, and this necessity of a reform found full expression in the *Augustana*, which thus became, emphatically, the Confession of the Great Reformation.

There is a marked distinction between revolution and reformation. Revolution rushes forward wildly and furiously, regardless of consequences. It seizes error with its Gothic hand, pulls it down, and carries devastation in its track, whether prepared to lay a foundation of truth upon its ruins, and to build a scriptural organization upon it, or not. Reformation moves forward more thoughtfully and cautiously, wisely anticipating consequences at every step. It understands error, and it is not afraid to pull down what is wrong and pernicious; but it is at the same time deeply concerned about, and diligently engaged in building up, what

is pure and beneficial. Consequently, the Confession condemns everything obviously contrary to Scripture, prevalent in the Church of Rome, and points out positively, that which ought to be adopted in its stead, consonant therewith: leaving such practices as were in themselves innocent, but which had become perverted and abused, to bring about their abrogation or modification, in God's own time.

As reformatory, it was adequate to this end. It was designed to reform the Church from corruption. It was so constituted as to reach it, in all its ramifications. It struck at the very heart of error, and impregnated all the veins and arteries of the Church with truth. It reformed doctrine and practice, worship and government. It demanded soundness of faith and purity of life. It imposed the obligation upon all who professed to receive it, as their standard of faith, not only to come out from the enclosures of the mystic Babylon, but never more to touch the unclean things. And, hence, the reformation which it required, and of which it became the mother Symbol, was real, and not merely imaginary; internal, and not merely external; thorough, and not merely superficial; comprehensive, and not merely partial; spiritual, and not merely formal; scriptural, and not merely traditional. These are the characteristics, which the pen of impartial history, has assigned to the Reformation; and as the Confessors of Augs-burg, were its originators and heroes, and as their Confession became the embodiment of their religious principles; and as these principles, consistently developed, did bring about a radical and scriptural reformation, it deserves to be characterized as thoroughly reformatory.

III. *The Augsburg Confession is purely evangelical.* The etymological meaning of evangelical, is according to the Gospel, but its historic meaning is salvation by grace. This signification it received in the Reformation, because of the peculiarity of the contest which then took place. When the struggle was contemplated from the stand point of Church authority, the side of the Confessors was called, Protestant; when from that of morals, the Reformation; when from that of doctrine, Evangelical. The controversy which then arose, was not confined to a single point, but involved the entire system of saving truth. The conflict did not commence, in a mere skirmish along the outposts of religion, but in a general battle around the very citadel of the plan of salvation.

Hence a comprehensive term was required to express the generic characteristic of the cause, espoused by the Reformers. That selected was evangelical. It was admirably adapted to its purpose. It expresses the idea of salvation through grace, maintained by the Protestants, in contradistinction from that of salvation through works, held by the Catholics. And as the article on justification determines the character of a standing or a falling church; so too, does it determine the character of a Confession, as either evangelical or un-evangelical.

We shall first apply this test to the Church of Rome. She divides justification into two parts. The first justification consists in the change of man's nature, by the physical action of God, and the second in strengthening him in his new condition, thus confounding justification with both regeneration and sanctification. Although a man is entitled in part to justification through the merits of Christ, these are nevertheless not sufficient, and hence he must earn the same for himself prior to his conversion, by his own strength and good works. This is called a merit of equity, by which is meant, that although man gains nothing by his good works before conversion, still it is equitable, that he should be rewarded for performing them, and hence he receives the first justification, i. e. regeneration. And after this, it becomes indispensable that man should continue to earn for himself the grace of God and eternal salvation, by keeping the commandments, and performing other good works. This is called the merit of condignment, through which he becomes worthy of salvation, and God becomes obligated to bestow it upon him, according to his unalterable justice. This constitutes justification and salvation by works, and as this conception pervades the Catholic Confessions they are found to be un-evangelical.

We now apply the same test to the Augsburg Confession. It teaches: "That men cannot be justified before God, by their own strength, merit, or works, but that they are justified gratuitously for Christ's sake, though faith; when they believe that they are received into favor, and that their sins are remitted on account of Christ, who made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death. This faith God imputes to us as righteousness." And as the character of faith affects the doctrine of justification, so too does the manner in which it is produced. Relative to this the Confession says: "In order that we may obtain this faith, the ministerial office has

been instituted, whose members are to teach the Gospel and administer the sacraments ; for, through the instrumentality of the word and sacraments, as means of grace, the Holy Spirit is given, who, in his own time and place, (i. e., when, and where, it pleases God) produces faith in them that hear the Gospel message, viz : that God, for Christ's sake, and not on account of any merit in us, justifies those who believe, that on account of Christ, they are received into the favor of God." And as the manner, in which faith was produced, affects the doctrine of justification, so too does the effect of faith, on the character of the life. On this subject the Confessors teach : "That this faith must bring forth good fruits, and that it is our duty to perform those good works, which God has commanded, because he has enjoined them, and not in the expectation of thereby meriting justification before him." And as the instrumentality and agency, through which faith is exercised, affects the doctrine of justification so too, does the instrumentality and agency, through which these good works are performed, and true holiness of heart and life, secured. Concerning this the Confession declares : "That Jesus Christ will sanctify those who believe in him, by sending into their hearts the Holy Ghost, who through the truth governs, consoles, quickens, and defends them, against the devil and the power of sin."

Thus does the Augsburg Confession utterly annihilate any claim of merit, which man can set up, as a ground of his justification before God. In order to secure his justification, an atonement was necessary ; God accomplished it through the death of his Son. To secure its benefits, faith is indispensable ; God produces it by the gift of the Holy Ghost. For its exercise, means are required ; God furnishes them by revealing the truth, and instituting the sacraments. To develop their efficacy, they must be brought into contact with the mind of man ; God attains this result, by the appointment of the ministry, to preach the one, and to administer the other. To prove its reality, this faith must produce the living fruits of holiness ; God gathers these under the influence of the same Spirit, and the efficacy of the same means, by which he developed the germ of faith in the soil of the human heart. Thus we see, that in this Confession, all that pertains to the origination of the plan of salvation ; all that pertains to its agencies and instrumentalities ; all

that pertains to the fulfilment of its conditions ; and all, that pertains to the effects of its acceptance, is attributed to the free and unmerited grace of God, and by consequence, denied as resulting in any wise from the natural ability, and the meritorious works of man. It is consequently, peculiarly distinguished by the characteristic, just considered, and deserves to be designated as purely evangelical.

IV. *The Augsburg Confession is decidedly orthodox.* The literal meaning of the word, orthodox, is correct as regards opinion. Its popular meaning is, sound in regard to the essential doctrines of religion. As applied to a Confession, it designates one conformed to the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, and its opposite, heterodox, one contrary to the Holy Scriptures. In this sense we apply it to the Augsburg Confession. Accordingly, we affirm, that all the essential doctrines of the Christian system, as revealed in the Bible, are either contained or implied, in its several articles. By essential doctrines, we mean those, the denial of any of one of which, would involve the integrity of the whole plan of salvation. Such are the doctrine of the Trinity of persons in the Godhead—the Divinity of Jesus Christ—the vicarious nature of the atonement—the total depravity of the human race—justification by faith alone—the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Ghost—the obligation to live a holy life—the appointment and perpetual obligation to use the means of grace—and the certainty of future retribution, involving the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the everlasting damnation of the wicked.

These doctrines are clearly set forth in the Confession. They are inseparably connected with each other, and the denial of the truth of any of them would, like the removal of the key-stone of an arch, involve the denial of all the rest. We do not mean, however, that every aspect of each of these doctrines is essential, either to its own integrity, or to that of the whole system. But we mean, that as the whole system has its accidents and its essence, and as the denial of any of its accidents, does not destroy its essence ; so too, has every doctrine, that enters into that system, its accidents and its essence, and a want of precise correctness of opinion, in regard to any one of its mere accidents, does not destroy the orthodoxy of him, who holds fast to its essence. And as all the essential doctrines contained in the Confession, are correctly taught, or to say the least and to adopt the phraseology of



the Formula of the General Synod, "in a manner substantially correct," it deserves to be designated as decidedly orthodox.

V. *The Augsburg Confession is eminently scriptural.* The Confessors acknowledged the Scriptures alone, to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and made them the sure fire, by which all Confessions were to be tested. They declare in the Confession itself, "That the word of God is justly to be held higher, than any customs of the Church," and in the articles of Smalcald more fully, that, "It is not right to make articles of faith of the words and works of the Fathers. God's word shall furnish articles of faith, and no one else; no, not even an angel." And their successors declared still more explicitly, in the Formula of Concord that, "Other writings of ancient or modern authors, whatever name they may have, are not to be held equal to the Holy Scriptures; but always to be subjected to the same, and shall not be otherwise or further accepted, than as testimony to indicate, in what manner after the apostles' times, and at what places, such doctrines of the prophets and apostles, were preserved."

They professed to have drawn the doctrines, contained in the Confession, from the scriptures, and to have admitted nothing into it inconsistent therewith. To this they thus refer in the preface, "Herein we also, with all due submission to your majesty, deliver the Confession of faith of our pastors, preachers and their teachers, which we also acknowledge as our own; and which in the present form is held, taught and instructed, as the same was drawn from the Holy Scriptures, in our countries, principalities, cities and dominions." They further declare, that nothing has been adopted among them, either in doctrine or ceremony opposed to the Scriptures; that they were compelled to correct the abuses of the Church of Rome by the word of God; and that they would not expose their own souls and consciences to the greatest danger before God, by misusing or abusing the Divine name and word, nor transplant, nor transmit to their children and followers any other doctrine, than is consonant with the pure Divine word and Christian truth; and that the doctrines, thus set forth by them, were clearly based upon the Holy Scriptures.

And in this effort they were eminently successful. For this they needed honesty, ability and opportunity. Their Christian integrity none dare question. Their ability, both

natural and acquired, experimental and spiritual, was of the highest order. Take them all in all, the princes and theologians, and they will compare favorably in this respect, with any similar number of Confessors, of any preceding or subsequent age. Their opportunities were peculiarly favorable. The Providence of God had been so ordered, as to call upon them to examine, in the most thorough and careful manner, the whole system of divine truth, taught in the word of God. The results of such study were in conflict with the teachings and practices of the Church of Rome. A controversy ensued, which had raged for nearly fifteen years. Again and again occasions occurred, when they felt themselves called upon to prepare articles of faith. At length the individual and collective results of all their studies and consultations, controversies and Diets, were collected and submitted to the finished biblical scholar and theologian, Philip Melancthon, by whom they were systematically arranged and lucidly expressed; and thus they received their symbolical form in the Augsburg Confession.

Many of the doctrinal positions of the Confession are stated in the very words of Scripture, and where this is not the case, they are frequently supported, by relevant proof passages drawn therefrom.

We do not, however, understand the Confessors to claim every phrase and expression, every statement and reference, introduced into their Confession. For a candid examination would prove, that it contains forms of expression, individual phrases, philosophical statements, historic references, individual opinions, numerous quotations and incidental matter, not drawn from the Scriptures. Nor would we maintain, that they were infallible, and that in every shade of thought expressed, they had caught the exact impress of the Divine Word; for, this is more than can be expected from any uninspired composition; but we mean to assert, that in regard to all the great truths of revelation, indispensable to soundness in doctrine, consistency in practice, and purity in life, they did succeed in discovering them, and in expressing them correctly in their Confession. This was acknowledged, even by some of the most candid among the Catholics themselves. The Bishop of Augsburg exclaimed after hearing it read, "All, that the Lutherans have said, is true; we cannot deny it." The Duke of Bavaria asked, "Can you, by sound reasons, refute the Confession of the Elector and his allies?" He answered, "With the writings of the Apostles

and prophets, No; but with those of the Fathers and Councils, Yes." "I understand it," replied he, "the Lutherans are in the Scriptures and we are outside of them."

Hence it proved itself invulnerable against the concentrated powers of the Vatican, it gained victory after victory over its forces and its dominion over the minds of emperors and kings, princes and nobles, pastors and churches, Professors and Institutions, villages and cities, states and empires. And, although sometimes, misunderstood by its friends, and perverted by its enemies, it has maintained its ascendancy for ages, and still sways its crowning sceptre over the consciences of more than half the Protestant world. Like the source whence it was drawn, which appears the more pure, as the light increases by which it is examined, so too has this Confession appeared the more scriptural, as the increasing light of philosophy and exegesis have been thrown upon it, and the profoundest biblical scholars and the most diligent students of the Confession, have been the most fully convinced of its truthfulness, and become its most ardent admirers, and its most able defenders. Having passed through this severe ordeal, and proved itself to be free from the dross of error, in the very refiner's fire of criticism, it has fairly won the characteristic of scriptural, with which we now cheerfully crown it.

VI. *The Augsburg Confession is consistently systematic.* It is divided into two grand divisions. The first contains the doctrinal articles, the second, the abuses corrected. The former constitutes a system of scripture doctrine, the latter, the application of the truths admitted into this system, to the Church of Rome. As such, it was to stand forth as the embodiment of the Gospel itself, and constitute a refutation of the errors of Catholicism. It was to be cast into the crucible of scholastic logic, all the dialectic powers of which, would be put forth to detect its inconsistencies, and to refute its positions. All this the Confessors knew, and hence we must expect, that they would endeavor to bring forth a production, in which their views would be clearly expressed, systematically arranged, and consistently stated.

"A system," says Webster, "is an assemblage of things, adjusted as a whole plan or scheme, consisting of many parts, connected in such a manner, as to create a chain of mutual dependencies." The Augsburg Confession contains the system of doctrines, held by the Confessors. It must be presumed, that they had formed an ideal of that system as a

whole, and that their Confession constitutes their attempt, to actualize it in the sphere of symbolic truth. It cannot be supposed, that they would knowingly admit any thing into their Confession which was incongruous to, and inconsistent with, the system of doctrine and practice, which it was designed to set forth. They endeavored to create a body of divinity, by framing its several members in such a manner, as to be adapted to, and mutually dependent upon, each other, and necessary to the constitution of an organic theological whole. And as the several members of a natural body, brought together mechanically, and placed at random in their positions, cannot form a consistent human system, so too cannot the different parts of a Church Confession, brought together in the same manner, constitute a consistent doctrinal system. And as, to constitute the former, the all-pervading influence of the life-force is necessary to bind all the members of the body together in organic unity, so, too, is the all-pervading life-force of justification by faith alone indispensable, to bind all the articles of the Confession together, and to cause them to develop their respective influences, consistently with each other. And no one can study the Confession, without feeling the constant presence of this all-characterizing life-force, and no one can interpret it truly and faithfully, without being constantly under its influence. Justification by faith involves the remission of sins. Whatever may be affirmed then, in any part of the Confession, concerning the remission of sins, must be interpreted consistently with, and not contrary to, this all-controlling doctrine. Let us test several of these articles, by this decisive criterion.

First, the article on Confession. "In regard to Confession it is taught, that private absolution ought to be retained in the churches." But did they intend to teach auricular confession by this, and thus contradict the doctrine of justification by faith? By no means. They denied that Confession had any scriptural authority, rejected the idea that a priest had power to forgive sins, and very soon abolished it, even in its ceremonial form. What then could they have meant by it? We answer by quoting the words of Luther, in his celebrated sermon on the remission of sins: "The remission of sins is out of the power of pope, bishop, or priest, or any other man living, and rests solely in the word of Christ, and thine own faith. For, if a simple believer say to thee, though a woman or a child, God pardon thy sin in the name

of Jesus Christ, and thou receive that word with strong faith, thou art absolved, but let faith in pardon through Christ hold the first rank, and command the whole field of your warfare." All that they could have meant by it consistently with their system was, the declaration of the promise of pardon, made by God to the penitent and believing soul, by whomsoever and whensoever uttered.

Take the article on the Mass. The Mass in the Romish sense they declare to be "an oblation for the living and the dead, in order to take away sins, and reconcile God." When, therefore, in the same article, they say that they have not abolished the Mass, but that they celebrate it with greater devotion and sincerity, it follows that they could not have used the word, Mass, in any other than in the evangelical sense, or as meaning by it, the Lord's Supper. And what consistency thus demands from us, in interpreting this article, the language of the article itself and the historic proof of its common use likewise require. They could not, therefore, have meant to contradict themselves in this article, or to teach any thing inconsistent with the leading doctrine of justification.

Take the article on the efficacy of the Sacraments. Concerning the use of the Sacraments they teach, that they were instituted, not only as marks of a Christian profession among men, but rather as signs and evidences of the divine disposition toward us, tendered for the purpose of exciting and confirming the faith of those who use them. Hence the Sacraments ought to be received with faith in the promises which are exhibited and proposed by them. They therefore condemn those who say, that the Sacraments produce justification in their recipients *ex opere operato* (i. e. from the mere outward performance of the act,) and who do not teach, that faith is necessary in the use of the Sacraments to the remission of sins." Two views are here presented concerning the efficacy of the Sacraments. The one is, that they produce their effects *ex opere operato*, the other, that they produce them according to the logico moral power of the truth, exhibited and sealed in them, as apprehended by the mind, and received by faith. The former was held by the Romanists, and involved baptismal regeneration, and sacramental justification. This the Confessors rejected. The latter was held by them, and was intended to be expressed in this article. We can elucidate it more clearly, by quoting the explanation given of it in



the Apology of Melancthon himself. "As the word penetrates the ear, so too is the external sign (of the Sacrament) exhibited to the eye, in order internally to move and excite the heart to the exercise of faith. For the word and the external sign operate in the same manner upon the heart, as Augustine has very strikingly said, 'The Sacrament is a visible word, for the external sign is a symbol, by which that is exhibited which is preached through the word; therefore, they accomplish the same thing in the same manner.' The principle difference, then, which exists between the efficacy of the preached word and that of the Sacrament, is, that in the one case the truth reaches the soul through the ear and in the other through the eye, and when apprehended and received by faith, produces in either case, both regeneration and justification, in those yet in a natural state, through the power of the Holy Ghost, accompanying the same, and enlivening and strengthening the faith of those, who are already in a state of grace." Accordingly the Confessors could not have designed to teach baptismal regeneration *ex opere operato*, either in the conclusion of the article on original sin, or in that on baptism, and both must be interpreted consistently with that on the efficacy of the sacraments, which we have just examined. And as the Confessors aimed at constructing a consistent system of Divine truth, it follows, that each part, admitted into the system, must have been regarded by them, as not only consistent with the whole, but as also consistent with every other part. And this fact must be kept constantly before us, in interpreting the different articles contained in the Confession. Let us apply this, as a rule of interpretation, to the third and tenth articles. In the third article the Confessors declare, that the person of Christ is constituted of two natures, human and divine, inseparably united, and in the tenth, that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, administered, and received in the Lord's Supper. Now, in determining the nature of Christ's presence and the manner of his reception in the Eucharist, we must be governed by the definition of the constitution of his person. The Christ, as thus defined, is the God-man, and can never again be either God alone or man alone, but must be and forever remain, God *and* man, inseparably one. The conception of the Divine nature in isolation is not the true conception of the Christ, but only of the essential part of the constitution of his person; and the conception of the

human nature in isolation is not the true conception of the Christ, but only of the other essential part of the constitution of his person. From the definition of the constitution of the person of Christ, it follows, therefore, that wherever Christ is present at all, he cannot be present, either in his human nature alone, or in his Divine nature alone, split into halves and separated, but that he must be present in his whole person, as constituted of natures both human and Divine, indissolubly united. And as the body of Christ with its blood constitutes an essential part of his human nature, it follows that wherever Christ is present, his body and blood are present also, and that whenever Christ is received, his body and blood are received also. But as Christ is a supernatural being; as the constitution of his person is a supernatural fact; as his body and blood glorified is a supernatural reality; and as he now belongs to the sphere of the supernatural world, it follows, that the nature of his presence, and the manner of the reception of his body and blood in the Lord's Supper, must be supernatural also. And as we still belong to the natural world, and as our rational and spiritual capacities are still limited by earthly bounds, it is not strange, that we should be unable to comprehend how the mystic bond unites inseparably the two natures of Christ; or how he can be present in the believer's heart, where two or three are gathered together in his name and every where else, in his whole person; or how he can become to us, "the living head, the head of God, the head of Life, whereof if a man eat he shall never hunger;" or how he can give us "his flesh to eat and his blood to drink;" or how, "the bread that we break" can become "the communion of the body of Christ, and the cup of blessing which we bless, the communion of the blood of Christ. We may, as Lutherans, affirm that Christ is present and received in the Eucharist, neither locally, naturally, grossly, materially, capernaitically, nor by transubstantiation, consubstantiation, subpanation or impanation; but, that he is present and received, truly, supernaturally, spiritually and sacramentally, or after a heavenly and incomprehensible manner. And we may thus endeavor to prevent misconceptions and misunderstandings, but after we have exhausted our entire vocabulary of predicates, we shall still find, that the whole subject is shrouded in impenetrable mystery. But we do not present what we have just written, either as a discussion of the

subjects contained in these articles, or as an argument to prove the truth of the statements made in them, concerning the person of Christ, and his presence and reception in the Lord's Supper, but as a logical deduction, demanded by the hypothesis with which we set out, that they were designed to be and must be interpreted as being consistent with each other. And as the different articles of the Confession, were intended to be, and must be interpreted, as consistent with each other, so too, must incidental subjects, introduced or remarks made, be interpreted consistently with each other. Let us apply this rule to the introduction of the subject of the Christian Sabbath, in the article on the power of the bishops, and an incidental remark, concerning the law of God, as found in the article on faith and good works. In the former the Confessors say that, "the Holy Scripture hath abolished the Sabbath," and that "the Christian Church had ordained Sunday." In the latter, they appeal to their writings on the Ten Commandments, to prove that they have not prohibited good works. Now, if what they declare in the twenty-eighth article be explained so as to make them deny the Divine institution and perpetual obligation of the Sabbath, then have they annulled and expunged one of the Commandments, and could not speak consistently of the Ten, but must have spoken of the nine remaining ones. But if we understand them to mean, that the ceremonial aspect of the Commandment of the Sabbath, viz, the observance of the seventh day as holy time, in the Jewish manner, was only abolished by the Holy Scriptures, and that the moral aspect of it, viz, the observance of one day in seven as hallowed time in the Christian manner, was not and cannot be abolished, then what they said concerning the ordaining of Sunday by the Christian Church, and the Ten Commandments, will be found consistent with what they had said, concerning the abolition of the Sabbath. The Christian Church of Apostolic times did, under the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, abolish the seventh day, Jewish Sabbath, and ordain the first day, Christian Sabbath, but in making this change of days, they only touched the ceremonial aspect of the third Commandment, and left untouched its moral aspect. And that the Confessors so understood the matter, and meant so to express it, is indisputably evident, from their writings on the Sabbath. And thus we might go on, and show that all the parts of the Confession, may be interpreted as being consistent with the whole, each article as consistent

with every other one, and each incidental declaration, consistent with every other casual remark, made in it. And while we claim this, we as readily admit, that the opposite may also be done, and the Confession interpreted, so that the parts will be found inconsistent with the whole, one article contradict another, and one sentiment stand in conflict with another. According to the former procedure, we can affirm the Augsburg Confession to be consistently systematic; according to the latter procedure, it may be declared to be inconsistent and unsystematic. But which is the correct procedure? Unquestionably the former. For, this is demanded by the laws of interpretation, by the acknowledged theological learning and logical ability of the Confessors, and by justice and fidelity to their great Confession.

Nor must the circumstances, under which the Confessors prepared and presented their Confession, be forgotten in interpreting its language. They were assembled at Augsburg at the call of the Emperor Charles V. The primary object of the Diet was to bring the Protestants and Catholics together, "to consult," as the Confessors say, "about the dissensions in reference to our holy religion and Christian faith—how the opinions and sentiments of contending parties on the subject of religion, might be mutually expressed, explained and considered,

\* \* \* with moderation, mildness and affection; so that what has been considered or acknowledged by each party in its writings, being abandoned or corrected, those opinions might be settled and reduced to one plain standard of truth and Christian harmony; that our pure and true religion, being cherished and preserved among us, we may be able to live in harmony and concord in one Christian Church." Accordingly they state, that in the preparation of their Confession, they have "withheld no effort which might contribute to the restoration of Christian harmony, consistent with the will of God, and the dictates of conscience." In making their Confessional contribution to the attainment of this acknowledged and much desired common end, they excluded the extreme positions separately taken, modified the offensive phraseology individually used, and stated the doctrines held, and corrected the abuses condemned, in the mildest manner and in the most moderate forms of expression, consistent with truth and honor. In other words, they yielded as much to the Catholics, and expressed



their views, as much in the language in common use in the Churches, as possible. Luther even censured Melancthon for having gone too far in this respect. Now, if all these facts be ignored, and the Confession interpreted, as though it had been prepared by its authors, at a time and under circumstances, when they were entirely untrammelled, with no other object in view, but to present their views of the system of Divine truth taught in the Scriptures, in the clearest, fullest, strongest, and most rigidly systematic manner, then of course, it can be made to contain a mere jumble of discrepancies and contradictions, and treated as if it were a load of theological metal in its crude form, which required to be cast into a symbolic furnace, in order to separate all the dross of Romanism from it, and preserve alone the pure gold of Protestantism found in it. But as it is a law maxim, that, the language of a statute must be construed so as even to bend it in favor of equity and justice, shall we be less reasonable in construing the language of the Confession, and rather bend it so as to make it teach error, than strain it, (if it were even necessary,) in order to cause it to exhibit only truth? In other words, the circumstances under, and the end for, which the Confession was prepared, not only allow, but demand for it the most evangelical and the least Romish interpretation, which the language, used by the Confessors, will possibly allow. And if this indisputable claim be met, we have no hesitancy in declaring, that it will stand fully vindicated as consistently systematic.

VII. *The Augsburg Confession is comprehensively catholic.* We use the term catholic, not in its historic, but in its literal sense, according to which it means, general or universal. A Confession becomes catholic, just in proportion as it states divine truth in a generic, and not in a specific form. According to this definition, the Apostles' Creed is the most catholic Catechism known, the Nicene less so, and the Athanasian still less so. The Augsburg Confession is less Catholic than either of these, because it embraces many more points of doctrine and practice, and exhibits them in a more specific form; but when compared, in this respect, with many of the subsequent Confessions of faith, adopted both by the Lutheran and the Reformed branches of the Church of Christ, it stands pre-eminent among them. Its statements are as general as the circumstances under which they were placed, and the end, they had in view, would allow, and they have proved to be sufficiently



so, to unite many of the most prominent of the different branches of the Protestant household of faith, when favorable opportunities occurred.

The Reformation consisted of three divisions, designated by the names of the three great leaders, Zwingli, Calvin and Luther. But when Luther and Zwingli met at Marburg, they united in confessing the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, leaving the mode and the manner of the reception, concerning which they differed, undetermined and as neither the mode of Christ's presence, nor the manner of the reception of his body and blood is stated in the 10th article of the Confession, multitudes of the followers of Zwingli have adopted it. And although the Zwinglians and the Lutherans remained separated from each other by the bitterness of theological controversy, nevertheless at the peace of Westphalia in 1648, the same privileges were granted the former, which had been enjoyed by the latter, and the Reformed were acknowledged and hailed as the friends of the Augsburg Confession. John Calvin was installed as Pastor and Professor of Theology in the city of Strasburg, in 1538, which in its collective capacity had signed the Augsburg Confession; he did the same, and appeared in 1541, in the religious deliberations of Worms and Ratisbon as a Lutheran theologian. And as it was Catholic enough for him, so too has it been for many of his followers.

But its Catholicity has been especially tested in these modern times. In 1856 a Church Diet was held in continental Europe, at which the four grand divisions of Protestantism, the Calvinistic, the Zwinglian, the Moravian and the Lutheran, were largely represented. Twenty-five hundred Professors, Theologians and Pastors had met to deliberate, concerning the adoption of the best means to advance the cause of Evangelical Christianity, against the inroads of Rome. Among others, they determined to make a united Confession of their faith. But they did not originate a new one. There was one in existence which had been drawn up for the same purpose ages before. It was selected as most befitting to their design, and re-confessed as the united and unanimous testimony of the truth by Protestant Europe. That Confession was the Catholic one of Augsburg. Other Confessions, adopted by some of the Lutheran Churches, have been rejected by others, but this has been received by all, and rejected by none. The Moravians selected it as the

bond of their fraternal union, and the Evangelical Church of Prussia was united upon it, in connection with the Heidelberg Catechism, by Frederick William, the King in 1825, so that it embraces in its Catholic arms nearly two thirds of the Protestant world. And as the Catholicity of its influence has come down to our day, so too does it extend back, and through the adoption of the ecumenical Creeds, which preceded it, it establishes its fellowship with the Confessors of the true Church, in every age which has gone before it. For, the Confessors of Augsburg expressly claim, that they have adopted no article of faith, and introduced no ceremonies of religion, which were inconsistent with those of the Universal Christian Church, and this claim they sustain by abundant quotations from the true witnesses of the Truth, down to the Apostolic Age. And this characteristic of the Confession, though mentioned last, constitutes the crown of its glory.

We conclude our article with a few practical reflections, calculated to remind us of our obligations to God, to the Confessors and their Confession, as well as to the cause, to which they devoted their lives.

1. We are called upon to manifest gratitude to God for raising up this noble band of Confessors, and qualifying them for their glorious work. If God worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, then a Church can neither rise, nor be reformed, without his superintending Providence. And as God saw the end to be accomplished, so too, did he see what instruments were necessary to its attainment. And as he determined the end, so too, did he order all the circumstances, required to call forth and qualify the instruments, to fulfil his holy pleasure. His hand is seen in the bestowment of the natural endowments of Luther and Melancthon, in ordering the circumstances of their childhood and education, and in the reciprocal influence, which they exerted upon each other. If Melancthon had been formed in the same iron mould, in which Luther was fashioned, he would not have been fitted to be the colleague of Luther; and if Luther had been formed in the same tender mould, in which Melancthon was fashioned, he would not have been qualified to be the leader of Melancthon. But God adapted the one to the other, and while Melancthon was a check to Luther, Luther was a spur to Melancthon. If the Elector John had been a time-

server, he could never have inspired his allies with the heroic spirit, which led them to be willing to sacrifice their fortunes, thrones and lives in confessing the truth and defending the Gospel; and if all this had been different, the cause of Protestantism would have been retarded in its progress, and sooner or later overwhelmed by its enemies. But the hand of God was upon them, his finger directed them, his grace sustained them, and his gracious favor crowned their efforts with extraordinary success.

2. We are called upon, to cherish their memories and imitate their example. The Scriptures declare, that the righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance, and enjoin the duty of following them, as they followed Christ. The Confessors were righteous, and they did follow Christ. They are, therefore, worthy to be enshrined in the "sunny memories" of our hearts, and deserve the most faithful imitation in our lives. They had not only discovered and confessed the truth, but they maintained and defended it. And in doing this, they neither shrunk from danger, nor were intimidated by opposition, nor faltered under the heavy pressure of suffering. Look upon John, leading the Princes into the presence of the second Diet of Spire, and pronouncing the solemn *Protest* against the repeal of the Edict of the first, and you behold an example of the morally sublime in the Prince! Look upon Luther, standing before the august Diet of Worms, refusing to recant a single syllable that he had written, and you behold the morally sublime in the Divine! The lofty spirit, thus exhibited, was infused into their coadjutors, both in the Church and in the State, and led them to resolve, with one heart and one mind, to be true to their consciences, true to their Confession, true to each other, and true to their God. May their mantel fall on us! But in contemplating their excellencies, and endeavoring to copy their virtues, let us not forget that they were human, and like all others, had their faults. Let us not shut our eyes to their imperfections, and in our excessive reverence for their characters, imitate and perpetuate their mistakes. But while we publish their achievements and glory in them, let us at the same time draw the veil of charity over their frailties and short comings.

3. We are called upon to prize the religious privileges conferred upon us, through their labors and sacrifices. Has the word of God been unbound? They broke the clasp, which closed it to our eyes. Have we found a spiritual

home in the Evangelical Church? They reformed and furnished it for us. Was the plan of salvation, through the riches of grace in Christ Jesus, been made known to us? They discovered and revealed it again. Was the throne of grace been made accessible to us, through one Mediator? They removed the obstructions which had been placed around it. Have the right of private judgment and liberty of conscience been exercised by us? They broke the yoke of ecclesiastical despotism, and proclaimed us free. Have we been reared under the elevating and ennobling influences of the Reformation? They were the agents, under God, of accomplishing it, and thus putting them into operation. Let us, therefore, not only prize these inestimable blessings, but endeavor so to improve them, that we may be deemed worthy, not only to be the recipients of them, but likewise to transmit them, as a rich inheritance, to the latest generations!

4. We are called upon, to carry forward the great work, so auspiciously begun by them. What was that work? The work of Church reform, and Church completion. They did not claim that their work, even as far as they had themselves accomplished it, was perfect, or that they had left nothing for their successors to do. On the contrary, they acknowledged that the work of reform, had only been fully begun by them, and they imposed upon their followers the duty of carrying it forward to completion. They laid the foundation, and erected the main building of the temple, leaving the extension of the wings, the completion of the dome and the laying of the cap-stone, to future generations. It was theirs to lay out an Eden; it is ours to keep and dress it. It was theirs to plant the Tree of Life; it is ours to water its roots and prune its branches. It was theirs to smite the Rock of the Gospel, it is ours to open channels, in which the streams of truth may flow through the deserts of earth. And where were they most successful in the prosecution of their work? When they were satisfied with the generic statements of truth, as contained in the Augsburg Confession; when in their preaching and writings they gave due prominence to the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel; when they manifested the spirit of forbearance and toleration in non-essentials, when they avoided "doubtful disputations" among themselves—and when they concentrated their united efforts against the common enemy. And how was their cause weakened and their work retarded?



By multiplying Symbols of Faith, by introducing into them a great number of topics, and stating them in all their details, by demanding an absolute subscription to their letter and form in their entire extent, by circumscribing within narrow limits the liberty wherewith they had themselves been made free, by magnifying differences of minor importance, until they seemed to occupy almost the entire field of their vision, by spending their energies in vain attempts to define the indefinable, by giving their imaginations unbridled range in the sphere of speculation, by withdrawing their consolidated army from the citadel of Rome, and turning the weapons of their warfare against each other, by forging wedges of schism instead of strengthening bonds of union, and by creating centres of theological gravity, whose centrifugal force tended more strongly to separation, than its centripetal force did, to concentration. And as the work, entrusted to us to carry forward, is the same in its nature, as the work begun by them, it follows that progression and retrogression will result from the same causes. And as by pursuing the former course, they made rapid progress in extending the Church, and by pursuing the latter, were almost entirely checked in their course, it becomes us so to profit by their experience, as to make them both an example of guidance to be followed, and a beacon of warning to be shunned. And while these lessons may be learned, from the history of the Confessors, as well as from that of their immediate successors, in the era of the Reformation, so too, may the same lessons be reviewed, by an examination of the history of the Lutheran Church in America, during the era of the General Synod.

5. Finally, we are called upon, to be true to the good Confession, which they witnessed before Charles. Every Church has an inner life and an outer manifestation. The truth, witnessed in its Confession, constitutes its internal life—the consistent development of it, its external manifestation. But as in the natural world, counteracting influences exist, which retard the steady and healthful growth of a plant; so too, do disturbing influences exist in the spiritual world, calculated to injure and stint the growth of a Church. And as these retarding influences can only be overcome, by bringing to bear upon the plant all the conditions of growth demanded by its nature; so too, can a Church alone overcome the obstacles in the way of its advancement, by bringing to



bear upon its members all the means of grace. Their number, nature, efficacy and use, are all determined in its Confession, and hence fidelity to its scriptural Confession insures the extension and sanctification of the Church. And as the nature of the life-force determines the form of the plant, so too, do the distinguishing characteristics of a Confession, determine the character of a Church. Fidelity to the Augsburg Confession, in faith and practice, will consequently stamp its characteristics upon the Lutheran Church. Under its controlling influence, therefore, she will be, and must forever remain, a protestant, reformed, evangelical, orthodox, scriptural, catholic and homogeneous Church. And as the Church is composed of her members, it follows, that fidelity to her Confession will likewise stamp its characteristics upon them. And wherever and whenever, the members of a Lutheran Church are found, who are true to her Confession, we hesitate not to affirm, that no more rigid Protestants, no more thorough Reformers, no more evangelical professors, no more orthodox believers, no more scriptural Confessors, no more consistent Christians, and no more catholic children of God, can be found in any Church on earth.

Let us then, stimulated by the achievements of the past, impressed by the wants of the present, and inspired by the hopes of the future, be true to the great Confession! To this, let the estimate put upon its value by Spalatin prompt us! "It is a Confession," said he, "the like of which has not been promulgated for a thousand years, no, not from the beginning of the world." To this, let the candid testimony of D'Aubigne impel us! "This Confession of Augsburg will forever remain one of the master-pieces of the human mind, enlightened by the Spirit of God." To this, let its controlling influence in moulding the opinions of the religious world move us! It constitutes the theological heart of Protestantism. Its great artery ramifies the whole body of the Lutheran and Moravian churches and supplies all their members with the blood of truth. A less artery reaches the German and Dutch Reformed Churches, through Ursinus, a disciple of Melancthon, and one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism. And a similar artery reaches first the Episcopal and then the Methodist Church, through the Thirty-nine Articles, which are largely indebted to it for their contents.

Let us then, be true to its spirit, genius and life! Let us not loose ourselves in its letter and form! Let us not man-

gle it by mutilations! Let us not misrepresent it by distortion! Let us not pervert it by misinterpretation! Let us not abandon it by defection! But on the contrary, let us glory in it, as the Magna Charta of Protestantism, as the Symbol of the Reformation, as the Confession of Lutheranism, and as the very sun of the Gospel, in which we have lived, and moved, and had our being. Laying our right hand upon the Word of God, and our left upon the Confession of Augsburg, let us vow, that we will maintain, honor, and defend the latter, as drawn from the former, at all times, at every sacrifice, and until death.

## ARTICLE VII.

### REVIVALS.

By PROF. L. STERNBERG, A. M., Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.

“From the fall of man,” says President Edwards, “to our day the work of redemption, in its effect, has mainly been carried on by remarkable communications of the Spirit of God. Though there may be a more constant communication of God’s Spirit always in some degree attending his ordinances, yet the way, in which the greatest things have been done, has always been by remarkable effusions at special seasons of mercy.” In reference to this language Dr. Beecher says: “Was that the way, in which the greatest things had been done, from the fall of man to the day of Edwards? And would a Christian philosopher hence infer, that *remarkable effusions of the Spirit, at special seasons of mercy*, would cease to be the chief means of promoting the work of Redemption; and the future be, in this respect, wholly different from the past? This inference, as applied to the period from Edwards until now, would to all observation be contradicted by fact. Things have proceeded, since the time of Edwards, as they had done before; and why should we expect they will proceed otherwise in time to come. Rather, should we not expect that ‘special seasons of mercy;’ *times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord*, which have been so greatly multiplied in our age, will become yet more

and more frequent, until there shall cease to be intervals between them, and they shall run into one another, and flow together, in one long and still spreading revival, which shall result in the conversion of the world."

If the fact be, as stated by the writers above quoted, then surely revivals are virtually and prominently connected with the development of the Church and the extension of Christ's kingdom on earth, and we may expect to find them recognized in the sacred Scriptures as occupying this important position.

In examining the Bible with reference to this point we meet with many peculiar expressions implying such special seasons of mercy, such as, "day of grace," "day of salvation," "day of (divine) power," "year of the right hand of the Most High," "raining righteousness," "pouring out the Spirit," "set time to favor Zion," "times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord," &c. Though some of these expressions may be so interpreted as to apply to the ordinary operations of the divine grace, especially under the Gospel dispensation, yet their frequency, variety of form and expressiveness are such as to preclude such restriction in their application, and we must admit that, according to their general tenor, they distinctly recognize "special seasons of mercy."

The same conviction is forced upon the mind when we consider some of the prayers and promises, recorded in the Bible for our instruction and encouragement. The Psalmist prays, "Wilt thou not revive us again: that thy people may rejoice in thee?" Habakkuk prays, "O Lord, revive thy work!" The promise of God, by the mouth of Isaiah, is, "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground. I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring. And they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water courses. One shall say, I am the Lord's: and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." The remarkable prophecy of Joel deserves special attention in this connection, since we have inspired authority (Acts 2: 16,) for considering it as referring to revivals of religion occurring under the Gospel dispensation. "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your

young men shall see visions : And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids, in those days, will I pour out my Spirit. \* \* \* And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered ; for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." When in the light of a prophecy like this we consider the willingness of our Heavenly Father to bestow his Spirit upon them that ask him, of which our Saviour has assured us, we must conclude that this precious gift, if our prayers be fervent and our faith strong, can be secured in any required measure of fulness. Prayers and promises like these teach us to look for "remarkable effusions of the Spirit, at special seasons of mercy."

Such seasons have occurred at various times during the whole history of the Church under both dispensations. Circumstances of time and place give a peculiar character to religious awakenings. The revivals that took place among the Jews under the Old Testament economy, and even that which sprang up under the preaching of John the Baptist, did not have precisely the same characteristic, as those enjoyed under a more spiritual dispensation, nor were they as frequent and powerful. "The last days" are peculiarly the times set for "refreshings from the presence of the Lord." The book of Acts is in great part a history of the various revivals in which the Church was originally established in different places. Among these the first and most remarkable was that, which occurred on the day of Pentecost shortly after the ascension of our Lord. It was preceded by a series of meetings of several days continuance, in which the time was mostly occupied in "prayer and supplication," (Acts 1: 14). "When the day of Pentecost was fully come," the Spirit was poured out in rich measure, attended by miraculous manifestations, frequently witnessed in the days of primitive Christianity, as well as by the more usual gifts of grace. The apostles, and especially Peter, preached with unwonted clearness and unction. Many were pricked in their heart, and cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" On that day three thousand souls, having "gladly received the word," were admitted by baptism into the Church, "and they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer." The fruits of this first and greatest of revivals under the new dispensation were not transient, nor did the

revival, like a sudden fire, soon burn itself out. Some time after this we read that "the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and they spake the word of God with boldness." "And believers were the more added unto the Lord, multitudes both of men and women." "And daily in the temple and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.

In Samaria there was a great revival under the preaching of Philip. At Cesarea, while Peter was preaching, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." At Antioch "the hand of the Lord was with them" that preached the Lord Jesus, "and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." So greatly was the gracious work, thus auspiciously begun, extended under the labors of Barnabas and Saul, who for "a whole year assembled themselves with the Church, and taught much people," that to the disciples at Antioch belongs the distinction of being the first who were called Christians. The labors of the apostle Paul were every where attended with such marked success in the awakening and conversion of sinners and in the edification of believers, that the record of them is but a history of successive revivals.

After the apostolic age, as worldliness crept into the Church and Christianity became corrupted, the revival spirit gradually decayed. Though God never left himself entirely without witnesses even in the darkest ages of the Church, yet the multiplication of outward forms and empty ceremonies, the introduction of unscriptural dogmas and superstitious practices, the hiding of the pure word of God and the open vices of the teachers of religion, as they were well calculated to crush all spiritual life out of the Church, so they were hostile to all genuine revivals. At length God interposed.

The Reformation of the 16th century was the greatest revival of modern times. Though peculiarly a doctrinal revival it also, through the Divine Spirit accompanying the truth, was attended with sanctifying power upon the hearts and lives of men. Multitudes during that remarkable era became the humble followers of Christ. Though the revival spirit again subsided in consequence of the internal and external troubles that afflicted Protestantism, yet the Bible and the preaching of the Gospel, which the Reformation had restored to the people, remained, and these divinely ap-



pointed means of grace were again blessed to the reviving of God's work first in Europe, and then in America, and then at various missionary stations among the heathen. Many of the revivals enjoyed within a century past have nearly equalled in power that which occurred on the day of Pentecost. Were the Church deprived of the fruits of these gracious visitations she would be shorn of her strength. Her pulpits would become mostly vacant, her Sabbath Schools and her prayer meetings would be closed, her benevolent societies and her missions to the heathen would cease to exist.

Revivals being so intimately connected with the whole history and development of the Church it becomes us carefully to study their *nature*, to consider their *desirableness* and to inquire into the *means* by which they may be promoted.

The word revival means to live again and is variously applied. Thus we may speak of a reviving of nature, a revival of business, a revival of ritualism, of superstition or of fanaticism, as well as of a revival of true religion. As things of real value are apt to be counterfeited, and as the counterfeit tends to depreciate the genuine article in the estimation of the undiscerning, it becomes us carefully to distinguish genuine revivals of religion from such as are spurious. To determine the genuineness of a revival we must consider its *source* and its *spirit*.

As it requires the exertion of as much power to revive as to impart life in the first instance it is manifest that a genuine revival of religion is not the product of human ingenuity or skill. Oratory says it is not in me. Special measures say it is not in us. Human passion foams and frets in vain. "Not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." A religious excitement, produced by man, may be like the wind and the earthquake, but God is not in the storm, and destruction marks its track. But a religious excitement, caused by the Spirit of God operating through divine truth upon the hearts of men, is a genuine revival of religion coming down upon churches and communities in refreshing showers of grace, turning barren wastes into fruitful fields, and causing the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose.

God is a sovereign. His Spirit is not subject to the manipulations of human power, either in the use of measures or of ordinances. He works where, when and in what

measure he will and none can hinder him. Yet in regard to the bestowment of the Spirit, his richest gift to men, as well as his minor benefactions, he "will be inquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them," and he has most solemnly assured us, that he is more willing to give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him, than an earthly parent is to bestow good gifts upon his children. An unusual faithfulness in the employment of one or more of the means of grace always precedes or immediately follows the outpouring of God's Spirit. "We then are workers together with God." "Thy people shall be *willing* in the day of thy power." While therefore a genuine revival of religion is neither of man nor by man, yet as the activity and zeal of the Church will always be responsive to the measure of spiritual influence she enjoys, as the more grace she brings into exercise the more she receives from above, it follows that in a revival of religion there is such an increased measure of spiritual influence and such an earnest co-operation with God on the part of the Church as is necessary to elevate the general tone of piety in a community, give unusual power to divine truth, and increased force to Gospel motives, whether brought to bear on saint or sinner. Then it is that the Church arises and shines for her light has come. "Great grace is upon all them that believe," and the unconverted, "pricked in their hearts," cry out in deep anguish of soul, "What must we do to be saved?" Then Christ "sees of the travail of his soul and is satisfied," and there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over sinners repenting.

The faculties of the human mind may be classified as intellectual, moral and emotional. These are so intimately connected, that they constantly act and react upon each other. Strike the key of our emotional nature and a responsive vibration passes through the moral and intellectual. So pour light into the intellect and its genial glow will fall upon the will and the affections. That we may rightly shape human conduct and determine human destiny we may appeal to them all. This God does in his word. He addresses himself to our understanding by informing the judgment. He appeals to our moral nature by presenting all the motives that should induce right decisions. In doing this he avails himself of our emotional nature. He raises our hopes. He excites our fears. Our sympathetic emotions are moved by the fatherhood of God, and by the brotherhood of Christ. Towards him especially who can be "touched by the

feeling of our infirmities," and "by whose stripes we are healed," the deep fountains of human sympathy are opened. From all this it follows, that a revival of religion cannot, in the nature of things, take place without more or less excitement, without a rousing up of all the faculties of the soul. Indeed nothing takes so deep a hold upon the springs of human emotion and action, as the subject of religion. And well may it do so, for it is the one thing needful, the pearl of great price.

But while the great Author of our nature did not intend that we should worship him in impassive frigidity; while the most acceptable worship is that, in which the heart is most deeply enlisted, yet it must ever be borne in mind that he requires an intelligent service, and that his Spirit operates through the truth. It is the truth, that must make us free, if we are to be free indeed. The mere excitement of the animal passions will leave us no better than it found us. It is a straw fire that raises a tremendous blaze, while it lasts, but it soon goes out. Scenes of wild excitement, produced, not by the truth and Spirit of God, but by the bodily exercise of groaning, shouting, clapping and stamping, too often witnessed, together with their lamentable results, bring genuine revivals of religion into disrepute, and cause many to fear rather than pray for their recurrence.

The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. The most intense religious interest is consistent with the most perfect order and decorum in the worship of God. Though there may be occasions when audible manifestations of feeling become irrepressible, yet such occasions are comparatively rare. Earnest attention, deep solemnity, the silent tear trickling down the cheek are surer indications of the presence of God's spirit in the midst of a worshipping assembly, and are more favorable for him to exert his saving power than the most boisterous demonstrations that ever turned the house of God into a Babel of confusion. We would not uncharitably judge or harshly condemn those who from custom prefer responses in the congregation and love themselves to join in them. Our aim is to show that as the Spirit of God operates through the truth, the conditions, most favorable for the reception of the truth, are best adapted for the divine Spirit to exert his sanctifying power. Every thing therefore calculated to confuse the mind, or to divert

it from the consideration of the great truths of revelation tends in so far to interfere with the progress of a genuine revival.

Revivals usually come in answer to prayer and in connection with the faithful use of the means of grace, among which the preaching of the Gospel stands pre-eminent; for God has determined "by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." The divine word is the sword of the Spirit, by which he achieves his glorious conquests. The law must be set forth in all its terrors, and shown to be exceedingly broad so as to produce conviction of sin. The Gospel plan of salvation must be unfolded, so that those who have been led to see the "exceeding sinfulness of sin" and to feel that it is a burden too grievous to be borne, may be able to "flee for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before them." When the law and the Gospel are clearly and faithfully pressed upon the attention of a community in humble reliance upon God for his blessing, it may be expected with some degree of confidence, that he will crown the divinely appointed means of grace with abundant success.

Though God is the author of every genuine revival, yet we may not feel constrained to exclaim in regard to some religious excitements, "Surely God is in this place," while in respect to others, the most sceptical are forced to acknowledge that it is indeed the finger of God. If left in doubt we should inquire into the spirit by which they are characterized. Imperfection is mingled with every thing human. Even in their holiest states it still appears, that men are not yet angels. Revivals are, therefore, not exempt from manifestations of human imperfection, even when they are evidently the work of God, and no reasonable person will altogether discard them on this account. On this principle he would have to reject all institutions existing among men, even the Church of Christ. Still the prevailing spirit of a genuine revival is very different from that of one that is spurious. Solemnity, humility and tenderness peculiarly characterize the former, while the latter is marked by self-sufficiency, self-exaltation and acerbity. The spirit which says, "Stand by thyself, I am holier than thou," which knows no zeal except for a party or sect, which has only words of bitter denunciation for all who cannot pronounce its own shibboleth, which is far removed from the meekness and gentleness of Christ is not of God. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gen-

tleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." These fruits abound in every genuine work of grace. Self is humbled, Christ exalted.

Such being the nature of revivals we proceed to inquire into their *desirableness*.

On the threshold of this inquiry, we are met by the broad assertion that they are not desirable at all, but that there is a more excellent way of building up the Church and extending the bounds of Christ's kingdom. When we inquire what this way is we are told that it consists in the religious training of the young, especially in catechetical instruction. We freely admit that the importance of thoroughly indoctrinating the young in the principles of our holy religion cannot well be overestimated. In connection with such instruction some of the most precious revivals of religion have been enjoyed. The seed of divine truth planted in the youthful mind, even if it does not germinate at once, yet in later life often produces a rich harvest of golden grain. Too much cannot be done in the Sabbath school, the Bible and the catechetical class in imparting religious instruction. But this by no means supersedes the necessity of revivals, but rather prepares the way for them and tends to make their results more valuable to the Church. If during the progress of such instruction there have been frequent conversions, then there has been a revival in that Sabbath school, or catechetical class. To such as remain unconverted at the end of such course of instruction a revival may come fraught with the richest blessings. We do not wish to be understood, as saying that conversions can only be expected to occur in connection with those more general awakenings that commonly pass under the name of revivals. "The gates of Gospel grace stand open night and day." It must, however, be evident that the unconverted will not only be more likely to turn to the Lord when the subject of religion commands general attention than at other times, but also that if the vast multitude who either do not enjoy Sabbath school and catechetical instruction, or have passed through it without being converted, or any considerable portion of them are to be saved at all, they must turn to the Lord in such numbers as to constitute a succession of revivals. Are we to give up as lost all who have not been savingly benefited by it? If so then ministers may as well quit preaching to their adult impenitent hearers, for if any number of them



may yet be converted, they may be converted at about the same time, and that would be a revival.

Our Sabbath schools and our catechetical classes need the baptism of the Spirit to give saving effect to the instruction imparted. No mere indoctrination into the truths of revelation, or into the peculiarities of any sect will prove a sure protection against infidelity, or save the soul from perdition. Notwithstanding the strict system of catechetical instruction practiced for so many generations in Germany and other European countries, rationalism and infidelity have made fearful inroads among the masses of the population. To prove an effectual safeguard against error, sin and ruin, the religious instruction of the young, like the preaching of the Gospel, must be thoroughly imbued with the revival spirit, a spirit which, in humble hope and faith, earnestly seeks, through the divine blessing, the immediate conversion of the pupil, and his entire consecration to the service of God. The most hopeful catechetical classes are those, into which the fruits of revivals are gathered.

But then we are told that catechetical instruction is the good old way, long sanctioned by our Church, that should not be abandoned by her loyal sons for new measures. We propose no abandonment of this good old way, though we should be glad to see an abuse which has grown up in connection with it, generally practiced in Germany and to a large extent in this country, at once corrected, viz, that candidates for confirmation, introduced into the catechetical class with reference to age rather than moral fitness, when they have completed the prescribed course of instruction, are examined only in respect to their doctrinal knowledge, and not with regard to their Christian experience. Though they may know nothing experimentally of a change of heart, may never have felt the pangs of conviction, or the joys of pardon, may never have received the spirit of adoption, or the spirit of "grace and supplication," yet, if they can pass a tolerable examination in the Catechism, and their moral character is respectable, they are admitted to confirmation. From this wretched abuse our Church has suffered more than from any other cause. It has filled her with the "wood, hay and stubble" of unconverted, worldly professors, who have hung, as a dead weight upon her spirituality and her Christian activity. With the fairest field for evangelical effort of any other denomination in this country, we are outstripped in the path of progress by those whom we should

leave far in the rear, because so small a proportion of our moral and material resources are really consecrated to God.

The system of catechetical instruction, however useful when properly carried out and however venerable, is of human and comparatively recent origin, while the essential features of the measures adopted in connection with revivals have their sanction in the word of God and are as old as the Church. They are *prayer* and *preaching*. We have already seen that the great revival on the day of Pentecost was preceded by a protracted prayer meeting, and that on that day the apostles, and especially Peter, preached the word with all boldness, and that in the subsequent progress of this gracious work the apostles preached daily in the temple and from house to house. To the elders of the church at Ephesus Paul said, "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shown you, and have taught publicly and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." A little farther on he says, "Therefore watch, and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." Here are mentioned several things, worthy of notice. The subjects of Paul's preaching were repentance and faith. So intense was his earnestness that he warned "with tears." He did not preach only in the day time and at weekly intervals, but "night and day." He believed in protracted effort, in consecutive presentations of the truth. The same means, that Paul employed so successfully in the promotion of revivals, are usually attended with like results at the present day. Any other measures in connection with persevering prayer and the consecutive preaching of the Gospel are merely incidental; auxiliary, if proper in themselves and called for by the peculiar circumstances; injurious, if improper, or inexpedient.

The anxious bench has been represented by some as being the very quintessence of revival measures, whereas in many powerful revivals it has not been employed at all, while its warmest advocate would not regard it as indispensable, nor think of resorting to it, unless a revival was already in progress. It is certainly desirable to afford those who are under conviction of sin an opportunity in some way to manifest their feelings, so that special prayer may be offered on their behalf by the Church, and that the pastor and

more experienced Christians may give them personal advice and instruction. On the day of Pentecost they that were "pricked in their heart" either came forward to Peter and the rest of the apostles, or cried out from the place where they stood or sat, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" They that, upon invitation, simply rise, or take a designated seat, or go to an inquiry meeting do essentially the same thing. Whatever measures it may be considered expedient to adopt to facilitate the progress of a revival and gather in its fruits, they have not produced the occasion, but are suggested by it. A revival is God's work. These are human expedients, not essential to the progress of a revival, but profitable in proportion as they are wisely adapted to the circumstances.

Preaching may, in a general sense, be said to be teaching and teaching to be preaching; but yet there is a marked distinction between them. Both are useful in their place, and both should be faithfully employed. Many possess the gift of teaching in an eminent degree, who would be ill adapted to preach the Gospel. It is the great business of the minister of Christ to preach, not to teach. Even the administration of the ordinances is of less importance. "For," says Paul, "Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel." We do not claim that a minister of the Gospel is restricted to preaching. Subordinate to this he may pursue other modes of doing good. These, however useful, are human devices, which cannot be put into competition with the preaching of the Gospel, a means of grace of divine appointment, under the faithful and consecutive employment of which so many revivals of religion have blessed the Church from the times of the apostles until the present day. Under the labors of some eminent servants of God, such as a Baxter and a Whitefield, an unusual measure of divine influence seems to have attended the delivery of almost every sermon, resulting in the conversion of some of the hearers.

The great *desirableness* of revivals it would seem must be freely admitted by all who concede the importance of vital godliness, of entire consecration to Christ and his cause. We know that declensions in religion occur from time to time, and we cannot but approve of revivals without assuming that such state of declension is better than one of revival. There have been dark periods in the history of the Church, when her fairest parts were overspread with error, supersti-

tion, ignorance of divine things, worldliness and crime. What would be the condition of the Church now, had not God, at "set times to favor Zion," poured out his spirit, and revived his work? Darkness would cover the earth and gross darkness the people. Without the effusion of the Holy Spirit the stated means of grace degenerate into an empty form, and the canker of worldliness destroys the life of piety. The spirituality of religion is lost sight of. Though the river of salvation is supplied by perennial springs of divine grace, yet it is necessary that copious showers of mercy shall from time to time swell its life-giving waters to fructify vast tracts that would otherwise remain barren wastes. A church without the revival spirit languishes, as to its spirituality, and dies. It may be clothed with outward pomp and power, but it ceases to be the birth place of souls and a nursery for heaven. Its imposing ritual may be a fine system of practical aesthetics, but is attended by no sanctifying power.

A true revival spirit is the most effectual barrier against fundamental error and infidelity. They that do the will of God shall know the truth. In proportion as the Church is led by the Spirit of God will she be conducted in ways of truth as well as holiness. The most conclusive demonstration of revealed truth is to experience its saving power. Spurious revivals may be prolific of error, but those that are genuine are more conservative of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel than any mere outward training can be, as is shown by the whole history of the Church, which has ever proved that where the revival spirit dies out, superstition, rationalism and infidelity soon sap the foundations of Christian doctrine.

The Church needs to be visited with revivals to qualify her for the work her Lord has given her to do. She is to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Had the Gospel continued to be propagated with the success that attended its first promulgation, we cannot doubt that long ere this "the heathen would have been given to Christ for his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." The apostolic age was pre eminently an age of revivals. But, alas, the revival spirit was soon, to a great extent, lost and with it the missionary spirit passed away. The great benevolent enterprises of the present day had their birth in revivals of religion. Under the powerful influence of revivals thousands, bound

by the iron fetters of popery and other forms of error, have cast off their chains and rejoice in the liberty, wherewith Christ makes his people free. Nations have been born in a day. A revival invests the Church with moral power. As a prince she has power with God and with men. "One shall chase a thousand and two shall put ten thousand to flight.

The world is yet to be converted. Christ shall reign as Mediator, till all his enemies shall be put under his feet. If the latter-day glory is ever to be ushered in, it is evident that all past effusions of the Spirit have been but as drops before a more plentiful shower: that the prophecy of Joel must yet receive even a fuller accomplishment than it did on the day of Pentecost. The great mass, not only of the present generation but of many succeeding ones will inevitably go down to perdition, unless the Lord rain down righteousness upon us in much larger measures of divine influence than the Church has hitherto enjoyed. This is the great want of the Church. It is not outward uniformity, dead orthodoxy, or sectarian zeal. It is that the Spirit of God may be poured out in large measure, vitalizing the means of grace, sanctifying the Church, calling forth her resources and inflaming her zeal. It is that revivals may intermingle and succeed each other until "every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of the Father," and the great jubilee of a ransomed world shall come.

"It has been inquired," says Dr. Beecher, "whether a more gradual dispensation of the Spirit, were not better than these sudden outpourings. But we have been accustomed to feel that God is the best judge in this matter, and that man cannot make a revival, either gradual or sudden. When he gives us drop by drop, we are thankful; and when the cloud of mercy above bursts and pours down a flood at once, we do not request him to stay his hand; we cannot but exult and rejoice in the exuberance of his mercy. Nor can we perceive how it is possible that eight hundred millions of souls, or any considerable part of this number, can be washed from their sins, within the most distant time to which the Millenium can be deferred according to prediction, by single drops falling in such showers and deliberate succession, as should not excite the fears, and should satisfy the prudence of some apparently very good men. We doubt not greater revivals, than have been, are indispensable to save



our nation and to save the world, by giving universal and saving empire to the kingdom of Christ; and as clouds thicken and dangers press, we look for them with strong confidence and with the increased urgency of unutterable desire."

If the state of the world at large is such as to need more copious showers of divine grace than have hitherto been enjoyed, this is peculiarly the case with our own country at the present time. We are in the midst of one of the most desolating wars known to modern times. Large portions of our lands are laid waste by fire and sword. Hundreds of churches have been broken up. Hundreds of thousands of our citizens have abandoned the peaceful pursuits of life and have sought the tented field. Though there have been many precious revivals in the camp, and thousands of our patriot soldiers have been converted, yet the general tendency and result of a state of war is adverse to the progress of the Gospel of peace. When this unhappy civil war shall close, as we trust it soon will close in the subjugation of the rebellion, the eradication of its causes, and the restoration of the Union, great responsibilities will at once devolve upon the Church. Then the waste places of Zion must be cultivated, our returned volunteers must be called upon to enlist for life under the banner of the Cross, the Church must receive a new baptism of fire, and the whole people, tried in the furnace of affliction, must seek to come out like gold purified in the fire. Then mere routine religious services, formal devotions, pompous rites, and imposing ceremonies will not meet the exigencies of the great occasion. Then, if we are to be, indeed, a free people, free from the power of anti-Christ and Satan, the means of grace must be vitalized, divine truth energized, Christian zeal aroused, and the Church sanctified by such effusions of the Holy Ghost, as this age and this favored land of revivals have not hitherto witnessed. If this country, as Providence seems clearly to indicate, is to provide with the bread of life the down-trodden millions of the old world that will here seek a refuge from oppression; if it is to carry the pure word of God to nominal Christians and benighted heathens the world over; if by the nature of our institutions, the character of our people and the effects of their enterprise, the destinies of the nations of the earth are to be shaped, how transcendantly important that the American Church, like the disciples in that

upper chamber in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, should be visited by the Holy Spirit, coming down like a rushing mighty wind and resting upon all her membership.

We proceed to consider the *means*, by which revivals may be promoted. These have, already, in general, been indicated in our discussion of the nature of revivals. A few additional observations will suffice for the illustration of this part of our subject. It should ever be remembered that though we may employ the means of grace we cannot command the grace. There is no such connection between them, as between cause and effect. They indeed that sow in tears may expect to reap with joy. Yet Paul may plant and Apollos may water, but God must give the increase. Nor does this increase always immediately attend the most diligent planting and watering. By giving his Spirit, God displays his fulness and our blessedness in having such a Father. By withholding it he shows his sovereignty, and our dependence upon him. While in general the Spirit of God accompanies the means of grace with a power, proportionate to the faithfulness with which these are used, yet often the most laborious efforts are attended by no commensurate results. On other occasions, with no preparation and without premonition the special presence of the divine Spirit becomes manifest, and the Church is led to exclaim, "Surely God is in this place, and I knew it not." Revivals cannot be produced at pleasure by human effort, as plowing and sowing will not insure a harvest. We should be co-workers with God. God works when and where he will.

The first suggestion that we offer in regard to appropriate means for the promotion of revivals is that every *stumbling block be removed out of the way*. This is preparing a highway for the Lord to come in the greatness of his strength. Where discipline requires to be exercised in a congregation let it be attended to, in the spirit of love and meekness, but with unfaltering firmness. Where there is alienation and strife among the membership, let judicious but decisive measures be taken to effect a reconciliation. Those that live in neglect of their Christian duties must be faithfully labored with. In many congregations there are chronic diseases of this kind, running sores that weaken the Church, destroy its moral power, and cause God to withhold his blessing. If under such circumstances special efforts be put forth for the conversion of sinners, these things at once work up to the surface and impair the efficiency of such efforts, or render them

entirely nugatory. As it was necessary to prepare the way of the Lord and make his paths straight in anticipation of the advent of the Messiah, so the way of the Holy Spirit must be prepared. Rain falls in vain upon the beaten highway, while the mellow and sown field smiles under every reviving shower. Could but the Achans in the camp of Israel be made to realize their guilt; could churches that are thus derelict in duty be made to see that souls are perishing through their neglect; did pastors in all cases realize their responsibility in this respect as they should, revivals would be far more frequent, extensive and blessed in permanent results. A church requires preparation in order that she may properly avail herself of the fruits of a revival. We should not wonder that so many young converts blossom fair, but shrink and fall when the fruit is scarce set, if we consider the blighting influences, to which they are often exposed from a state of things in the church, such as that to which we have alluded. Where such stumbling blocks exist in a congregation, it may be addressed in the language of Hosea, "Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap in mercy, break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek the Lord, till he come and rain righteousness upon you."

Another means for promoting revivals is that we *prayerfully look for them*. Prayer and faith have achieved the mightiest conquests the world has ever witnessed. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of all them that diligently seek him." The Holy Spirit has been especially promised in answer to prayer. There are those, who seem to suppose that revivals are only to be expected to occur at particular seasons and in connection with certain special efforts. Hence, except at such seasons, they neither expect nor labor for the conversion of sinners and the increased sanctification of the church. The heart and conscience are not addressed with the directness and fervency that would be employed in the midst of a revival. It is not strange if under such circumstances a spiritual dearth should ensue. Nor would it be strange if God's blessing should be withheld, when those entertaining such views put forth special efforts for the conversion of sinners. "The Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save" at one time as well as at another, by many as well as by few. We should never hide ourselves from his presence, but should be ever on the alert, watching for his footsteps in the garden of his planting. We should ever with unutterable desire

pray for the divine blessing to attend the stated means of grace and look for the first drops of mercy that may precede the coming shower. When a church is found in such a posture she will not, in general, be required to wait long for a gracious "refreshing from the presence of the Lord," and for the genial rays of the Sun of Righteousness to ripen the spiritual harvest. Then let her gird herself for the work; let all enter the harvest field and bring home their sheaves with "shoutings of grace; grace unto it." A revival thus commenced will require extra labor to extend and deepen its beneficent results; but it calls for no force work. The church has but to follow where God leads. To work with him is easy, without him fruitless.

Nor is it necessary, in all cases, to wait until a revival has actually commenced before it is proper to multiply the means of grace. God's time is always. Whenever his people are willing, they may expect a day of his power. "According to thy faith, be it unto thee." Whenever, therefore, a church is found humbly sitting at Jesus feet waiting, praying for the gifts of his grace, she may enter upon special efforts for the conversion of sinners with the confident expectation that they will be crowned with the divine blessing. Let her be actuated by a genuine love for souls and not by sectarian zeal; let her employ weapons of heavenly temper, and not resort to mere worldly management; let her remember that through Christ she can do all things, without him nothing, and she will not labor in vain, to spend her strength for naught. To embark in such efforts without preparation, and in a self-reliant, self-righteous spirit is a hazardous undertaking. The Gospel under such circumstances will be more likely to prove a savor of death than of life.

The Sabbath School is one of the most hopeful fields for Christian effort. In many cases a revival begins there. There is criminal neglect, when it is suffered to end there. When God is evidently moving upon the hearts of the children in an unusual degree and they are consecrating their lives to his service, then there is great encouragement to hope for a more general effusion of the Holy Spirit, and the faithful pastor, who watches the signs of the times, will be disposed to throw open the doors of the sanctuary and invite all classes to come in, and share in the blessings of divine grace.



The prayer-meeting is the surest spiritual thermometer, by which the warmth of devotion in a church may be tested. Then the prayers of the brethren are evidently not mere formal utterances; when there is concentration of desire; when there are earnest breathings after God; when there are wrestlings of spirit; when there is unusual solemnity and tenderness, then the Saviour is knocking at the door of that church. Let it be opened. "Fear not daughter of Zion; behold thy King cometh."

When the stated preaching of the Gospel becomes searching and powerful; when the congregation is not only interested but deeply impressed, when the preacher hides behind the cross, and nothing is thought of but the solemn import of his message: when the quivering lip and the tearful eye indicate that here and there a shaft has entered between the joints of the harness; when one and another tremblingly ask, "What must I do to be saved?" Then let the church with all her energies go to building up the walls of Zion, for the set time to favor her has come.

Nor need we despair if none of these visible manifestations of the Spirit's special presence are witnessed. Unknown to us, there may be wrestling Jacobs in the church. There may be closets which none but the eye of God has seen. There may be some lone sufferer, some afflicted saint, praying for the peace of Jerusalem. Many a one, as a prince, has power with God and prevails, whose voice is never heard in the prayer circle, or in the great congregation. Eternity alone will reveal, how much the church has been benefited by the prayers of Christ's hidden ones.

The progress of a revival depends much on the character of the praying and the preaching. Rounded periods, the flowers of rhetoric, and the arts of oratory are futile. Prayers should be brief and to the point, expressing the earnest longings of a burdened heart. Sermons should be neither tame nor declamatory, but in "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," the minister of Christ should reason of "righteousness, temperance and judgment to come." Much care should be exercised in the selection of suitable topics. The guilt, helplessness and danger of the sinner; the atoning sacrifice of Christ; the way of salvation by repentance and faith, and a holy life, as the fruit of faith, are the great subjects to be illustrated and enforced; and it should be done with such tender earnestness as to convince the hearer that the preacher seeks not them, but them-



Nor is it a matter of small moment how we sing. The sentiment of the hymn should be appropriate. In rendering it, heart is of more consequence than art. "I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the understanding also."

Solemn responsibilities devolve upon a church that has been visited with a revival in respect to gathering in its fruits. We refer not to the gathering of them into the church, though this is important, but to the introducing of young converts into the varied activities of the Christian life. They need doctrinal instruction. They need spiritual counsel. But above all they need encouragement and direction so that, following Him, who went about doing good, they may at once enter upon paths of usefulness. In the prayer-meeting, in the Sabbath school, in tract distribution, at the sick bed, in the hovel of the poor, among their associates, among the ignorant and depraved, in the many forms of Christian benevolence, by prayer, by exhortation, by the consecration of their time, talents and property to the service of their Master, let them become co-workers with God in ameliorating and elevating the condition of our race, and in bringing the blessings of the great salvation provided in the Gospel home to every heart. The first inquiry of the soul, is, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" That is the golden moment to be seized, with which to commence a course of Christian effort on behalf of a sin-ruined world. Thus are built up the pillars of the Church. Thus are developed the noble benefactors of our race. If this golden moment be left unimproved, the young convert may soon sink back into forgetfulness of God, or persuade himself, that it is enough to have united with the church and quietly move on with the crowd of fruitless professors. Through such sad neglect, powerful revivals often result in a large increase, it may be, of the membership of a church, but in only a small addition, to its spirituality and moral power. Young converts, instead of growing up to the "full stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus" are dwarfed or crippled for life. Revivals are brought into disrepute, and the cause of Christ suffers.

## ARTICLE VIII.

INSPIRATION.—TRANSLATED FROM ZELLER'S "BIBLISCHES WÖRTERBUCH."

By CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

"All Scripture" of the Old Testament "is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3 : 16), that is, *breathed* into the writers by God, spoken to them internally and pervaded by the Lord who "is that Spirit" (2 Cor. 3 : 17). The apostle here describes the Old Testament, presented to us in a written form, as the production of the Holy Spirit, who communicated to the writers the thoughts, expressions, facts and entire narrative, for the purpose of being committed to writing. The Church, with strict consistency and in accordance with the sacred writers themselves, assigns in a similar manner the writings of the New Testament to the Spirit of God as their author. The most valuable features of elaborate human writings—well-arranged and desirable materials clothed in appropriate language—are derived from an author's natural gifts, or his profound study of the subject and diligent investigations, or a peculiarly happy frame of mind during the composition. Such attributes in the Holy Scriptures are the result of an intimate union of the spirit of man with the Spirit of God, by which the revelations of the latter in their pure and unperverted form enter the former. The several parts of the Scriptures are either directly dictated by the Spirit of God, (for instance, the writings of the prophets and the apostles) or, are at least written under the guiding and sanctifying influence of the Spirit (for instance, the Gospel of Luke, see ch. 1 : 1-4 ; &c.) These causes have given to the Scriptures the character which they really possess, that is, they are, not the word of man, but *the word of God*. We here perceive unquestionably a wonderful interposition of God—he descends and takes part in the human processes occurring in the writer's soul. But is not every genuine revelation a wonderful act of God in which he connects himself with the sphere of human life? Now the Scriptures constitute a part of God's revelations, and are indeed so necessary a part of them, that we may with truth

maintain that it would be impossible for us to possess any certain knowledge of the revelations of the Lord without *Scriptures*, that is, writings containing God's Word. As the *Scriptures* do not themselves state the doctrine of Inspiration in all its details, we may be here allowed to state the principles which it is necessary to adopt on this subject; we derive them from the declarations of the Word of God respecting divine revelations in general.

I. The following is the fundamental principle on which the doctrine of the inspiration of the *Scriptures* reposes:—the Holy *Scriptures* did not proceed from man, as the result of devout meditation, or of religious enthusiasm, or of the action of a tenacious and faithful memory, but from a direct act of divine grace; the Holy Spirit spoke and gave; the human writer usually gave to others simply that which had been thus imparted to him. This principle is expressed in the Hebrew phrase translated: "God put in the heart" (*Ezra* 7: 27; *Neh.* 2: 12). The heart is ordinarily regarded as the original source of man's thoughts. Now if it is necessary that any thought should first be put in the heart by the Lord (as *Joab*, for instance, put certain words in the mouth of the woman of *Tekoa*, *2 Sam.* 14: 3) it follows that this thought could not have proceeded from man originally. This principle is further illustrated by the promise which Christ gave to his disciples respecting the testimony to be given by them before the world (even as the *Scriptures* are themselves such a testimony): "Take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." (*Matt.* 10: 19, 20). The same principle is involved in the phrase which frequently occurs: "God spake by the mouth of the prophets, &c." Its truth is, besides, demonstrated by the fact that these witnesses clearly distinguish between the special revelations of the Spirit, and the suggestions of their own minds, even after they had been sanctified by grace. Thus, when Paul treats of marriage, he expressly says (*1 Cor.* 7: 25) that the judgment which he gives is, indeed, that of one who has the Spirit of God (*ver.* 40), or the weighty opinion of a regenerated Christian, but that, nevertheless, it is not one of those special and extraordinary revelations, such as he at other times received (for instance, *7: 10; 11: 23*). Both *Moses* and *Jeremiah* confess that they had at first been unwilling to speak in the name of the Lord.

cases are, besides, described, in which the former, although God spake unto him, as a man speaketh unto his friend (Exod. 33: 11), was compelled to wait until the mind of God should be revealed to him (Lev. 24: 12; Numb. 15: 34). Jeremiah confesses that after he had long labored as a prophet and the word of the Lord had become his joy and rejoicing (15: 15), he had desired to lock up that word in himself, but that the Lord had prevailed over him (20: 7-9). When these Holy men of God (2 Peter 1: 21) accordingly spoke or wrote, they clearly distinguished in this manner between that which was divinely given, and that which was of human origin. The erroneous view which represents Inspiration as merely a devout frame of mind, would ultimately lead to the conclusion that the ordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, which continually direct and quicken the believer, are simply human emotions, and thus all true and positive religious life would be extinguished.

II. If we then adhere to the fundamental doctrine that the Scriptures result from extraordinary communications granted by the Divine Spirit to the hearts of the writers, and that this Spirit also gave the words which were to be recorded, it is at once apparent that the *mode* in which these communications were made, must be inexplicable, and that all questions which mere curiosity might propose, are inappropriate. It is a mystery of God, bearing his Holy seal—it cannot be explained by us who are neither prophets nor apostles. Still, the believer meets with declarations which fully satisfy his soul. The words of Peter respecting the prophets of the old covenant are remarkable: "They spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1: 21), that is, even as the Spirit of Christ that was in them, carried, led or conducted them, towards the Lord and the objects that were to be revealed. Two points respecting the inspiration of the Old Testament are here exhibited to our view—its grandeur and its shadowy character. A certain grandeur appears in it; for there is something lofty in the circumstance that the spirit of a man, which is usually restricted to the body and to the knowledge derived ultimately through the bodily nature, should be transported by the Lord beyond these limits and raised upward to the contemplation of the divine mysteries of the kingdom. And yet the shadowy character of that inspiration is not concealed.

It consisted in the circumstance that the prophets were only *led or conducted* by the Spirit, and divine life was not made by it to constitute man's internal nature—the prophet, viewed merely as a man and independently of his office, according to which he testified concerning the future redemption, still remained under the law. The situation of the writers of the New Testament was different in this respect. Their inspiration is founded on Regeneration; they are children of God, in whom through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, a new man is begotten of God, who is blessed in the liberty of Christ. But the inference can by no means be thence drawn that the inspiration of the New Testament is simply the natural and obvious result and external manifestation of regeneration, and that the sacred writers occupied merely the same position which all believers assume. On the contrary, only a few were chosen, to whom the Spirit was thus given, not merely as ‘fire’ (Matt. 3 : 11, for the death of the old and the establishment of the new nature), but also as ‘power’ (Luke 24 : 49 ; 1 Cor. 2 : 4 ; ch. 12). Inspiration was an act of the Spirit of the Lord, which was superadded to Regeneration.

III. If the Holy Ghost has been figuratively termed the living and moving finger or hand, and the human writer the harp, this image, when correctly employed, does not imply that the latter necessarily was a blind, inanimate instrument, never moving except by an outward or foreign impulse. For we have already seen above that these witnesses received divine revelations with full consciousness, that they engaged in moral labors, and in some cases sustained an inward contest, before they devoted themselves in unconstrained and voluntary obedience to the service of the Lord. The Scriptures, indeed, never speak of a compulsory, immediate and paroxysmal inspiration of the Spirit, except in the case that a warning is given to the wicked (Job 33 : 15–18), or among pagans, or in the case of weak and irresolute servants of God, like Sampson, &c. The writers of the Old Testament, on the contrary, were holy men (2 Pet. 1 : 21) who had, independently of their calling as prophets, voluntarily yielded to the discipline of the Holy Spirit and who walked in God's ways; when they listened to the divine communications from above and then spake, it was done in faith, and their obedience was the obedience of faith. The witnesses of the New Testament were disciples of Christ and had been baptized with his Spirit; but where His Spirit is, *there is liber-*



ty. These circumstances have given to the Scriptures their animated and varying form. They do not merely furnish a system of faith and of morals dictated from above, neither are they simply historical narratives. In many portions the experience and the sufferings of the writers are interwoven with the divine revelations, so that they constitute truly a word or book of real life in all its aspects. We accordingly find in them not only an account of that which each witness received from the Lord, but also of the mode in which he received it, of their own inquiries and reflections, and of their fidelity, in consequence of which a still more weighty trust could be placed in their hands (1 Pet. 1: 10-12).

IV. From these statements it appears that the words quoted above: "It is the Spirit of your father which speaketh in you," by no means exclude a certain influence which the personal character, natural abilities and peculiar circumstances of the writer might be expected to exercise on the mode in which he bears witness. While the souls of the sacred writers were pervaded by the Spirit of the Lord, his words received a certain human and varied coloring from them respectively. The note emitted from the harp and the flute may be the same, and yet the difference of the sounds of the two instruments is instantly perceived: the same light of the sun elicits the fragrance of the flowers of a garden, and yet under its influence each flower emits its own peculiar fragrance. So, too, it is one and the same Spirit that worketh all in all the sacred writers, but the style of speech varies according to the position of the individual under the old or the new covenant—there is a difference between the style of Isaiah and that of Jeremiah, between the style of Paul and that of John.

V. This influence of the writer's personal affairs does not, however, affect a single letter of the Lord's promise: "The Spirit will guide you into *all truth*" (John 16: 13). No error of any of the writers as men, exercised the least influence on the testimony given in the Scriptures. The influences of the Divine Spirit when divine truth is communicated by inspiration, entirely exclude the influence of human errors. In matters which did not affect the truth of the kingdom of God, the Spirit no doubt permitted each writer to record the materials furnished by his memory (and indeed some external circumstances seem to have been unknown to one or the other writer). We find, for instance, that the first visitors at the grave of Christ bear different names in

the writings of the Evangelists. The openness and ease with which these variations are introduced, may convince an unprejudiced mind that such external matters are of no consequence whatever, in the view of the Divine Spirit, in reference to any influence on the kingdom of God. But that Spirit permitted no witness whose instrumentality he employed, to pronounce actual errors, untruths or deceitful words. Even in external matters, in points belonging to Geography, Natural History, &c., many statements, which enemies have attempted to represent as erroneous and ridiculous, have, at a later period, when investigations were conducted with increased knowledge and more favorable opportunities, now been triumphantly sustained. If doubtful or difficult passages still remain, that fact demonstrates that it is the part of wisdom to withhold a rash and premature judgment respecting supposed errors in the Scriptures, and to wait until a satisfactory solution can be obtained. The declaration cannot be overthrown: "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because *the Spirit is truth*" (1 John 5 : 6).

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### LANGE'S THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

It is proposed to issue an American Edition of the *Bible-work, or Theological and Homiletical Commentary, on the Bible*, now in course of preparation by the Rev. Prof. John P. Lange, D. D., of the University of Bonn, in connection with a number of distinguished divines and pulpit orators of Europe. The New Testament is nearly complete with the exception of the Romans and Revelation, and the Old Testament will follow in due time. But the proposed English edition will for the present only embrace the New Testament.

The work of Dr. Lange and his co-laborers was hailed at the appearance of the first volume as a great desideratum.

no commentary of this kind having been attempted since Dr. Starke's voluminous *Synopsis Bibliothecæ Exegeticæ*, of 1740, and has already met with unusual success, both in Europe and America. The plan is admirable, and the execution exhibits not only a high order of talent, but in some parts even rare genius and an overflowing wealth of ideas. The work embraces a new and accurate version of the text with an ample introduction and analysis, and a three-fold commentary under three distinct heads, as follows:

I. *Exegetical and Critical Notes*, which present the most valuable results of ancient and modern investigations of Biblical scholars.

II. *Doctrinal and Ethical Ideas* ; or the leading theological and religious thoughts and reflections contained in, or suggested by, the text.

III. *Homiletical and Practical Suggestions* ; with a rich variety of themes and parts for sermons, and useful practical hints, well calculated, not by any means to supersede, but to stimulate the labor of preparation for the pulpit, and to open the inexhaustible wealth of the Bible for purposes of edification.

The work, though mainly designed for ministers, is free from the pedantry of learning and accessible to educated laymen. Its tone and spirit is sound, truly Christian, evangelical and catholic. We have heard but one voice of commendation in its favor, from eminent divines of various denominations, who are acquainted with it. Of all larger commentaries, it bids fair to become, if it is not already the most useful and popular among ministers, theological students and such laymen who have taste and leisure for a more extended study of the word of God. It is more particularly the *Pastor's Commentary* ; it forms almost an exegetical library in itself and must take rank among those books which are constantly consulted as safe guides and intimate friends.

The English translation will aim to be a faithful and free re-production of the German original in its integrity, with such occasional addition in brackets, as might be of special use to the American reader. The Edinburgh translation embraces only the first three Gospels and will not be carried on any further. It will be used as a basis, but subjected to a thorough revision, word for word, according to the latest edition of the original. The typographical arrangement

will be altogether different, far more convenient and economical and adapted, as much as possible, to the original.

The American Editor, an intimate personal friend of Dr. Lange, has on consultation with him and with his full approbation, consented to superintend the preparation and publication of the American edition. He has already prospectively secured the co-operation of a number of distinguished divines of the leading evangelical denominations of the land, each of whom will be responsible for the particular portion of the work assigned to him. It is in no sense a sectarian, but a truly evangelical catholic commentary, and in this spirit and aim, it will be prepared for the benefit of the American public.

The several books of the New Testament will be issued and sold separately. The first volume, containing the general introduction to the Bible, and the Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, prepared by the Editor, will appear early this year. The whole New Testament, will embrace from eight to ten volumes and will be furnished in three or four years. Subscribers for the complete work will receive the several parts as they appear, by mail or express, free of expense. But each volume will also be sold separately.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church of America will be well represented in this noble and eminently useful literary enterprise, by the Rev. Prof. Dr. Charles F. Schaeffer, and the Rev. Dr. Charles P. Krauth, Jr., who have already an established reputation, as thorough Biblical and Anglo-German scholars and successful translators. Dr. Schaeffer is busily at work on Lechler and Gerok's Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, which is one of the best parts of Lange's *Bibelwerk*, and expects to have it ready for the press, during the course of the year 1864.

As this Commentary embodies the best fruits of the modern Biblical scholarship and pulpit eloquence of evangelical Germany, and will be especially adapted to the use of American readers by the various translators, it may be certain of a hearty welcome, especially among the ministers of the Anglo-German churches of America.

The publisher, Mr. Charles Scribner, of New York, will spare no pains and expense to get the work out, in a style worthy of its character and of his own reputation as a publisher of good, useful and substantial books.

## ARTICLE X.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*A History of Christian Doctrine.* By William G. T. Shedd, D. D. In two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863. These Lectures are the result of the author's studies, whilst he was occupying the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History in the Theological Seminary, at Andover. They are divided into seven books: (1) Influence of philosophical systems upon the construction of Christian Doctrine; (2) History of Apologies; (3) History of Theology (Trinitarian) and Christology; (4) History of Anthropology; (5) History of Soteriology; (6) History of Eschatology; (7) History of Symbols. It is an elaborate and able contribution to our theological Literature, written in a clear and concise style by a philosophical Christian scholar, valuable not only to the professional student, but to all intelligent Christians. In so excellent a work, we regret that we are obliged to take exception to any of its statements. The most unsatisfactory portion of the work is that which treats of the Symbols of the German Churches. The author, is in error when he says, that the *Confessio Saxonica* and the *Confessio Wurttembergica* constitute a part of Lutheran Symbolism. They were drawn up, the one by Melancthon and the other by Brenz, only for a temporary purpose and were officially acknowledged by a very small portion of the Church. The Symbols, generally recognized, are the *Augsburg Confession*, *The Apology*, *The Smalcald Articles*, *The Catechisms of Luther* and the *Formula Concordiæ*. He is, also, mistaken, when he asserts that the Lutheran Church teaches the doctrine of *Consubstantiation*. The term is not to be found in any of our Symbols, and it has always been rejected by the Church. The real presence of Christ's glorified humanity in the Holy Supper is something very different. So too the term Absolution, as used in the Lutheran Church, is also misapprehended. By it nothing more is meant than the announcement of God's promises to the penitent, that his sins are forgiven, if he has exercised a godly sorrow, and trusts in the merits of Christ. We cannot believe that our Confession "contains Romanizing elements," that it "teaches Papal errors," or that "like the Popish theory, it promotes a superstitious feeling in reference to the Eucharist." But this is not the first time we have been compelled to remonstrate with some of our American authors, in reference to the want of accuracy as to the Lutheran Church; not because we have supposed they desired to misrepresent the Church, or were unwilling to do us ample justice, but from a want of acquaintance with our internal history and a proper insight into our doctrinal peculiarities.

*The Heidelberg Catechism in German, Latin and English;* With an Historical introduction. Prepared and published by the direction of the German Reformed Church in the United States of America. Tercentary Edition. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863. This interesting volume is designed to commemorate the Tercentary Anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism, the Symbol of a large and prominent portion of the Protestant Church, in this country



and in Europe. The Catechism is conveniently arranged in four parallel columns, the original German, the Latin, modern German and English versions, and is intended as a critical, standard work of the Church. The three languages in which it has been issued, the ability and care with which it has been edited, as well as the historical introduction, give great value to the work and render it an object of interest not only to the members of the German Reformed Church, but to Christians of every name. The paper and typography of the work are very beautiful. We should be gratified to see the Augsburg Confession presented to the public in the same attractive style.

*A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life.* With a Complete Bibliography of the subject. By William Rounseville Alger. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1864. This work is one of profound research and immense labor, the result of patient study and unwearied thought. The whole field of discussion is divided into five parts: (1) Historical and Critical introductory views; (2) Ethnic thoughts concerning a future life; (3) New Testament views concerning a future life; (4) Christian thoughts concerning a future life; (5) Historical and Critical dissertations concerning a future life. Under these different heads is embraced whatever material relates to the history, philosophy and theology of the subject, carefully gathered from every available source. Whilst the work possesses great ability and learning, and is marked by thoroughness and candor in its discussions, it contains a large amount of error. We differ from the author on several historical points, Biblical interpretation and doctrinal belief. We object to the manner in which he speaks of some of the fundamental truths of our holy religion, of the cardinal doctrines of redemption through the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ, of the resurrection of the body and the eternity of future punishment. The tendency of the work is materialistic. The most valuable portion of the volume is the Appendix, prepared by Ezra Abbott, of Harvard University, a model of special bibliography. It gives the whole literature of the subject, a catalogue of works, relating to the nature, origin and destiny of the soul, embracing upwards of five thousand distinct publications on the Future Life, classified and arranged chronologically with notes and indexes of the authors and subjects.

*The Great Stone Book of Nature.* By David Thomas Ansted, A. M., Late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, &c. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1863. "There is but one way," the author remarks, "in which Geology can be understood, and that is by a thorough familiarity with all that is going on now, both in the animate and inanimate kingdoms of Nature. These represent the language in which the Stone Book is written." The author shows that the same causes are now in progress by which all the changes in the past have been effected, and traces the result which these causes have produced. The organic remains, the supplies of fuel, the pre-Adamite world, the glittering treasures of the earth, the metallic wealth and the circulation of water present discussions of interest, stranger than romance itself. The book is an instructive and popular exhibition of a most interesting department of science.

*The Mercy Seat; or Thoughts on Prayer.* By Augustus C. Thompson, D. D., Author of "The Better Land," "Morning Hours at Patmos," etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863. This is a systematic and very suggestive treatise on a most delightful and important subject, written

in a clear and fervent style and illustrated with forcible incidents, by an author favorably and extensively known. All who are in the habit of resorting to the mercy seat will find aid and comfort in its perusal.

*Christianity the Religion of Nature.* Lectures delivered before the Lowell Institute. By A. P. Peabody, D. D., LL. D. Preacher to the University, and Plumer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard College. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. These able Lectures on Natural Religion, originally prepared for the Lowell Institute, embrace the following subjects: Natural and Revealed Religion—Revelation—Miracles—Records of Revelation—the Love of God—the Providence of God in Human Art—the Providence of God in Human Society—the Holiness of God—God in Christ—Immortality—Christian Morality—the Natural Religion of the State—the Sabbath, a Law of Natural Religion. They are impressive, full of thought, rich in illustration, and of great excellence in style, worthy of the high reputation, which the author enjoys. There are a few expressions which might have been omitted, and some parts, presented and more fully carried out with greater positiveness.

*Music of the Bible:* or Explanatory Notes upon those passages in the Sacred Scriptures, which relate to Music, including a brief view of Hebrew Poetry. By Enoch Hutchinson. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. This is an elaborate commentary upon the music and poetry of the Bible, and may be regarded as a valuable contribution to our Biblical Literature. The work is unique, and gives evidence of the learning, critical skill and industry of the author in this particular branch of study.

*Geographical Studies.* By the late Professor Carl Ritter of Berlin Translated from the original German by William Leonhard Gage. Boston. Gould and Lincoln. 1863. Ritter, who died in 1859, was regarded as the most distinguished geographer in the world. To his discoveries and teachings are we indebted for many works, whose influence in this department of study has been so widely extended. The volume before us contains an interesting sketch of Ritter by the translator, a former pupil and an ardent admirer, with a full account of his geographical labors by Dr. Bügekamp, an essay, introductory to general comparative geography, observations on the fixed forms of the earth's surface, the geographical position and horizontal extension of the continents, remarks on form and numbers as auxiliary in representing the relations of geographical spaces, the historical element in geographical science, nature and history as the factors of natural history, and the external features of the earth in their influence on the course of history.

*The Witness Papers.* The Headship of Christ and the rights of the Christian People, a Collection of Essays, historical and descriptive sketches, and personal portraiture. With the author's celebrated letter to Lord Brougham. By Hugh Miller. Edited with a Preface by Peter Bayne. Boston. Gould & Lincoln. 1863. Hugh Miller has hitherto for the most part been known as a scientific author, chiefly in the department of Geology, but in this work containing a series of polemical discussions, he is presented as the champion of the Free Church of Scotland during a very important and serious conflict in her history, her struggle in 1843 for spiritual independence, showing himself equal to the task undertaken and fully establishing the doctrine, that Christ is

King and Head of the Church and the State has no right to exercise spiritual jurisdiction over ecclesiastical affairs.

*Jerry: or the Sailor Boy Ashore.* Being the seventh—a fragment—in the series of the Aimwell Stories. By Walter Aimwell. To which is added a memoir of the author, with a likeness. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. We have, several times, directed the attention of our readers to this interesting series. We are acquainted with no books, more instructive and attractive to the juvenile reader. This is an unfinished volume, on which the last labors of the author were expended, but written in the same excellent spirit, and with the same high aim.

*The Constitutional History of England since the accession of George Third, 1760–1860.* By Thomas Erskine May. In two volumes. Vol. II. Boston; Crosby & Nichols. 1863. The second volume of this important history, which we commended to our readers in a former number of the *Review* has made its appearance. It discusses the following topics: A history of party, of the press and political liberty—of the Church, of civil and religious liberty—of local Government—of Ireland before the Union—of British Colonies and Dependencies and of the progress of Legislation—its policy and results. The author's labors seem to have been conducted with conscientious industry and much valuable information is communicated.

*Chambers' Encyclopædia: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge for the People.* Illustrated. Vol. V. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1863. We have several times taken occasion to speak of the excellencies of this work. Every succeeding volume, as it is issued from the press, impresses us with the conviction of its great value. We believe that we are conferring a public service, when we direct attention to the publication. The present volume opens with a brief sketch of John Mason Good and concludes with an article on Labor and Laborers.

*The Book of Days.* A Miscellany of Popular Antiquities in connexion with the Calendar, including Anecdote, Biography and History, Curiosities of Literature and Oddities of human life and character. Edited by R. Chambers. In two volumes—vol. I. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1863. This interesting work is entirely *sui generis*. It is full of information—matter, which you might search for in vain in any other publication. It consists of (1) Facts, connected with the Church Calendar, including the Popular Festivals, Saints' Days, and other Holidays, with illustrations of Christian Antiquities in general; (2) Phenomena, connected with the Seasonal Changes; (3) Folk-Lore of the United Kingdom, viz: Popular Notions and Observances, connected with Times and Seasons; (4) Notable Events, Biographies and Anecdotes connected with the Days of the Year; (5) Articles of Popular Archæology, of an entertaining character, tending to illustrate the progress of Civilization Manners, Literature and Ideas in these kingdoms; (6) Curious, Fugitive and inedited Pieces.

*Annals of the Army of the Cumberland,* comprising biographies, descriptions of departments, accounts of Expeditions, Skirmishes and Battles: also its Police Record of spies, smugglers and prominent rebel emissaries. Together with anecdotes, incidents, poetry, reminiscences, etc. and official reports of the Battle of Stone River. By an Officer. Illustrated with steel portraits, wood engravings and maps. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. This work is not intended as a History of the Rebellion, but is simply a collec-

tion of sketches and portraits of representative men and a number of events connected with the Army of the Cumberland. It is a book rich in facts and illustration, and a most interesting contribution to the literature of the War.

*The Peninsular Campaign in Virginia*, or Incidents and Scenes on the Battle-fields and in Richmond. By J. J. Marks, D. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co, 1864. This volume, written by our friend, Dr. Marks, a Chaplain in the Army and for some time a prisoner at Richmond, is one of much interest. Although not philosophical, or designed as a connected history of the Campaign in Virginia, it is full of the author's experience, and scenes which he witnessed, the most remarkable incidents, thrilling narrative and striking illustration, and, gives the reader a very distinct impression of the character of the Rebellion and the infatuation of our misguided brethren in the South. The author was in Gettysburg, for several weeks after the memorable battle, laboring in connexion with the Hospital work, and we feel no hesitation in endorsing the truthfulness of the statements contained in his book.

*Letters to the Joneses*. By Timothy Titecomb. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863. The popularity of Dr. Holland, as an author, is well established. In the present volume he points out, in an easy and familiar style, the foibles and mistakes, incident to human character, and presents motives and suggestions for mental and moral improvement. The letters seem to have been written with a desire to correct evils, that are found to exist in almost every community, and are distinguished by the same sterling qualities, strong, practical common sense, which characterize his former publications. Whilst we might object to some portions, as rather latitudinarian, we believe the book will be read with interest and do good.

*Gilead: or the Vision of All-Souls' Hospital*. An Allegory. By J. Hyatt Smith. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863. In this vision, Dr. Smith gives the various methods, which individuals have employed to cure the malady of sin. The allegory is well managed, the illustrations of truth and duty are appropriate, and the views presented, sound and scriptural. The reader, in its perusal, is continually reminded of Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress.

*The Sergeant's Memorial*. By his Father. New York: A. D. F. Randolph, 1863. This volume was prepared by the Rev. J. P. Thompson, D. D., in memory of his son, who died at the early age of twenty in the service of his country. It is a book of no ordinary interest, not only on account of its being a beautiful and touching record of a most lovely young man, of unusual promise, frank, noble and Christian, who was a great favorite with all who knew him, but for the earnest, patriotic spirit which it breathes and the impressive lessons which it conveys. The bereaved parent has most delicately executed his part of the work.

*The Young Patriot: A Memorial of James Hall*. Boston, Massachusetts Sabbath School Society. This also is the record of the brief career of a patriotic Christian youth, who gave himself to his country and his God in the present great national struggle. It is the life of one, whose pure and beautiful character is worthy of an enduring memorial.

*Reminiscences of Amherst College*. Historical, Scientific, Biographical and Autobiographical: also of other and wider life experiences. With four plates and a Geological map. By Edward Hitchcock. Northamp-

ton, Mass. Bridgman & Childs. 1863. The title sufficiently explains the character of the volume. It is a collection of the most interesting and instructive facts, on a variety of topics connected with an Institution extensively and favorably known, by Dr. Hitchcock, so prominently and honorably identified with its history from the beginning. It is full of practical lessons of the most valuable wisdom, interesting not only to the friends of Amherst, but to all our Literary Institutions in the land.

*Questions on the Life of Moses*, embracing the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. By John Todd, D. D., Pittsfield, Mass. Northampton, Mass.: Bridgman & Childs.

*A Question Book*: embracing the Books of Joshua and Judges. For Sabbath Schools and Bible Classes. By John Todd. This is a continuation of a series, commenced some years ago, and favorably noticed in the *Review* of 1856. It is worthy of the high endorsement, given to it by some of our most eminent clergymen and teachers. Dr. Todd is well known for the interest he takes in the young, and his successful efforts for their improvement. All the productions of his pen may be safely recommended.

*The Common Place-Book to the Holy Bible*. By John Locke. Revised by Rev. William Dodd, LL. D.—“A Dictionary of the Holy Bible” for general use in the study of the Holy Scriptures with engravings, maps and tables. “The New Testament” with brief notes and instructions, designed to give the results of critical investigation, and to assist common readers to understand the meaning of the Holy Spirit in the inspired word, including the references and marginal readings of the Polyglot Bible. “The Bible Text Book,” or the principal texts, relating to the persons, places and subjects, occurring in the Holy Scriptures, arranged for the use of ministers, teachers, visitors and all students of the Bible. With two maps, and a variety of useful tables. “The Bible Atlas and Gazeteer,” containing a list of all Geographical names with references to their Scripture places and to the proper maps. “Morning Exercises” for every day in the year. By Rev. William Jay. “Evening Exercises” for every day in the year. “Village Sermons;” or Fifty-two plain and short discourses on the principal doctrines of the Gospel. By Rev. George Burder. “Practical Truths.” By Archibald Alexander, consisting of his various writings for the American Tract Society, &c. “The Afflicted Man’s Companion;” or a Directory for persons and families afflicted with sickness, or any other distress. By Rev. John Willison. “The Complete Duty of Man;” or a System of Doctrinal and Practical Christianity, designed for the use of families. By Henry Venn, D. D. “The Sabbath,” viewed in the light of Reason, Revelation and History, with a sketch of its literature. By James Gilfillen. The volumes, whose title page has been given, are all valuable. They will be found useful helps in the study of the Scriptures and in the cultivation of piety. The literature of the American Tract Society is of a high order. Ever keeping before it the object for which the Society was instituted, its publications are adapted to every circumstance and occasion, and their circulation has been accompanied with the most blessed results. Through its agency many homes have been gladdened, and many a heart has rejoiced. The Institution was organized in 1825. Its publications have been issued in one hundred and thirty-seven different languages and dialects. Its claims upon the sympathies and cooperation of the benevolent of all evangelical denominations cannot be questioned.



*Lyrics of Loyalty.* Arranged and edited by Frank Moore. New York: G. T. Putnam, 1864. This is the best collection of the kind which the present Rebellion has elicited, and will be read with interest long after the occasion, which produced them, has passed away. No one is better qualified than the Editor of the "Rebellion Record" to prepare such a book, and among the contributors we find the names of Bryant, Longfellow, Whittier, Benjamin, Read, Holmes, Leland, Emerson, Sigourney, Stowe and others, well known to fame.

*Rebellion Record.*—Number 41 of this work is just published, and the documentary history of the War is brought down to Nov. 1863. The work is growing in value with every succeeding number, and should have a place in every Library in the country. Parts 39 and 40 contain full and interesting reports concerning the memorable Battle of Gettysburg.

*The Bibliotheca Sacra.* The last number of this admirably conducted *Quarterly* is one of unusual interest. Two of the articles are by ministers of our own Church—"Athanasius and the Arian Controversy" by Rev. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, and "Charles Wesley and Methodist Hymns" by Rev. F. M. Bird. The work continues to sustain its elevated character, and is devoted to the discussion of the great principles of evangelical truth. It is the repository of general and choice knowledge in the wide domain of sacred literature.

*The Atlantic Monthly*, devoted to Literature, Art and Politics. From the commencement of its career this monthly has maintained a high literary standard, and among its contributors are to be found some of the ablest and most successful writers in the country. We trust Longfellow will complete his version of "Dante's Paradise," so successfully commenced in a former number.

*United States Service Magazine.* This Magazine, three numbers of which have appeared, is issued monthly by C. B. Richardson, of New York, and designed to furnish full and authentic information of the condition and progress of military affairs in the United States and Europe. It supplies an important want at the present time, and is deserving of a liberal patronage. The contributors are some of our most distinguished military, scientific and literary men. Prof. Jacobs, of Pennsylvania College, contributes to the January and February numbers. The work is under the editorial supervision of Professor Coppee, whose experience and literary abilities eminently qualify him for the position.

*Harper's New Monthly Magazine* has a larger circulation than any similar publication, and continues to take the lead of all our Pictorial Magazines in the variety and interest of its matter. Its illustrated articles are entertaining and useful, whilst its contributions generally are of a high order. There is no periodical in the country of its kind, which can be compared to it.

*Littell's Living Age* is published weekly, and usually contains a very attractive list of articles, admirably suited to the taste and circumstances of thousands, who have neither the disposition nor the means to procure the Foreign Magazines, and yet are desirous of forming an acquaintance with English periodical literature. Mr. Littell's selections are generally judicious, and we seldom meet with an article to which the most fastidious could take exception.

*The Prophetic Times.* A new serial, devoted to the exposition and inculcation of the doctrines of the speedy coming and reign of the Lord Jesus Christ and related subjects. Edited by Rev. Drs. Sciss, Newton,

Duffield and others. Philadelphia. This work has reached the third number of the second volume. It is published in monthly numbers, and is an able exponent of the Millenarian views of Sacred Prophecy.

*The Evangelical Lutheran Church*: Her glory, perils, defence, victory, duty and perpetuity; a discourse for the three hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of the Reformation. Delivered in St. John's Church, Nov. 1st, 1863. By Charles P. Krauth, D. D., Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co.

*Loyalty to the Government*: A Thanksgiving Sermon, delivered in Selinsgrove, Pa., on the 6th of August, 1863. By Rev. P. Anstadt, A. M. *Lutheran Kirchenbote*.

*Historical Discourse*, delivered before the Schoharie County Bible Society, at its Semi-Centennial meeting in the Lutheran Church, Schoharie, N. Y., Oct. 6th, 1863. By G. A. Lintner, D. D., President of the Society. Albany: J. Munsell.

*The Wonderful Confederation*: A Discourse on Eph. 6: 12. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1864.

*The Lord at Hand*: An Advent Sermon. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Lutheran Publication Society.

*Not Dead but Sleeping*: Remarks at the Funeral of Miss Sallie Keller, Oct. 20th, 1863. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Pastor of St. John's. Philadelphia: J. R. Bryson.

*A Synodical Discourse*, delivered at the opening of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Central Pennsylvania, Mifflintown, May 20th, 1863. By Rev. D. H. Focht, A. M., President of Synod. Gettysburg: H. C. Neinstedt.

*Experimental (not Ritual) Religion, the One Thing Needful*. A Sermon, delivered in Newville, Pa., before the West Pennsylvania Synod, Sept. 18th, 1863. By B. Kurtz, D. D., LL. D. Baltimore: T. N. Kurtz.

*The True Catholicity of Christianity*. A Sermon, delivered before the Synod of East Pennsylvania. By Rev. F. W. Conrad. Selinsgrove: Lutheran Kirchenbote.

*America's Blessings and Obligations*. A discourse delivered in Trinity Lutheran Church, Lancaster, Pa., on the Day of National Thanksgiving, Nov. 26th, 1863. By Rev. F. W. Conrad. Lancaster: John Baer's Sons.

*Liturgisches Kirchenbüchlein; oder: Die Ordnung des Haupt-Gottesdienstes an Sonn- und Festtagen*. Aus der Liturgie und Agende für die Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten. Herausgegeben von Pastor S. K. Brobst. Allentown, Pa., 1864.

*Die Kraft des Evangeliums*. Predigt von Pastor S. K. Brobst in Allentown, Pa., gehalten in Reading, am 31. Mai, 1863 bei der Versammlung der Lutherischen Synode von Pennsylvania und den benachbarten Staaten.

*Lebens-Beschreibungen, oder Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Schriften aller Evangelist.-Lutherischen Prediger, welche seit Dr. Heinrich Melchior Mühlberg's Zeit im Staate Pennsylvanien Gemeinden bedient haben oder noch bedienen, u. s. w., zusammengetragen von Joh. Heinr. Conr. Schierenbeck, Ev. Luth. Prediger in Newcastle, Lawrence Co., Pa. Erstes Heft*. Selins-Grove, Pa. In der Druckerei des "Lutherischen Kirchenboten." 1863.

## CONTENTS OF NO. LIX.

---

Article.	Page
<p>I. SACRAMENTAL MEDITATIONS ON THE PRESENCE OF THE GLORIFIED BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IN THE HOLY SUPPER.—TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. ERNST SARTORIUS,.....</p>	311
By Rev. G. A. WENZEL, A. M., Philadelphia.	
<p>II. UNIVERSITIES.—TRANSLATED FROM THE GER- MAN OF REV. AUGUSTUS THOLUCK, D. D.,...</p>	351
By Rev. F. A. MUHLENBERG, A. M., of Pennsylvania College.	
<p>III. MISTAKES OF EDUCATED MEN,.....</p>	375
By S. AUSTIN ALLIBONE, LL. D., Philadelphia.	
<p>IV. OUR GENERAL SYNOD,.....</p>	390
<p>V. QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE LORD'S PRAYER.— TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. FRANZ DELITSCH, .....</p>	410
By Rev. G. F. KROTEL, A. M., Philadelphia.	
<p>VI. THE LITERATURE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES,.....</p>	416
By JOHN G. MORRIS, D. D., Baltimore, Md.	
<p>VII. REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MIN- ISTERS,.....</p>	428
<p>VIII. REMARKS UPON THE MEANING OF βαπτίζω, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT,.....</p>	449
By E. GREENWALD, D. D., Easton, Pa.	
<p>IX. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS, .....</p>	452

The opening article of this number, on "The Patriarchs of Lutheranism from Halle," abounds in interesting and valuable matter, breathes a most excellent and happy spirit, and is full of important, practical suggestions. The second article is a valuable translation from the German of Dr. J. H. Kurtz, by Rev. E. J. Koons. Mr. Officer's article on "Paul, the Missionary Apostle," is very good. It has pith and force, and is just the sort of thing we need for rousing us to the spirit of missions. "The Christ of History," by Dr. Dickson, is the product of a reader and thinker, in whose contemplations there is a tender and devotional vein, very pleasant and profitable. "The Battle of Gettysburg," by Professor Jacobs, will be read with deep interest. The sixth article on the "Confessors and the Confession of Augsburg," is by the Rev. F. W. Conrad. Few articles in the Review have gratified us more than this. The article shows a great deal of care, thought and labor. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, presents, in his characteristically accurate manner, a translation from Zeller, on the subject of "Inspiration." Every man in our Church, who reads anything, ought to read the Review. A publication so meritorious in itself, and so important to our Church, should be properly sustained.—*Lutheran & Missionary*.

The article on the Patriarchs of the Lutheran Church is full of valuable information and throws a new light on the beginnings of the Lutheran Church in this country. "Paul, the Missionary Apostle" is very characteristic of the shrewd, pithy vigor of Mr. Officer's mind. Dr. Dickson's "Christ of History," apparently called forth by Renan's Life of Jesus, is a suggestive paper upon Christ's place in History. Prof. Jacobs' paper, on the Battle of Gettysburg, reads like the narrative of one who had seen and been a part of what he tells. Many thanks to the Professor for his contribution. Mr. Conrad's "Confession of Augsburg," is elaborate and full. Prof. Sternberg's article on "Revivals," is a just and temperate discussion of the subject.—*Lutheran Observer*.

The April number of this *Quarterly* has come to hand with its usual promptness and usual variety of well written articles.—*Lutheran Standard*.

This is a live periodical, filled with ably written articles on all the prominent topics of interest in the Christian world.—*American Presbyterian*.

The first article is an interesting contribution to the history of the Lutheran Church in the United States. The article on the "Battle of Gettysburg," by a Gettysburg Professor is among the best accounts of that memorable event.—*Methodist*.

An excellent number of this excellent Review.—*Congregationalist*.

The number for April is before us, and is made up of the most substantial matter. Two articles particularly attracted our attention. The first is "The Patriarchs of the Lutheran Church from Halle," by Prof. Stoever. As an historical paper it possesses rare interest, and as a literary production may be held up as a model. The other is an article by Prof. Jacobs, on "The Battle of Gettysburg," in which the author gives a condensed, intelligent and correct account of that memorable event.—*Star & Banner*.

THE  
EVANGELICAL  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LIX.

JULY, 1864.

ARTICLE I.

SACRAMENTAL MEDITATIONS ON THE PRESENCE OF THE  
GLORIFIED BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST IN THE HOLY  
SUPPER. — TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR  
ERNST SARTORIUS.

By Rev. G. A. WENZEL, A. M., Philadelphia.

(Continued from page 71.)

3. *The Reformed Dissent.* (a) The points of difference. The joyfulness of our sacrifice of praise is disturbed by the dissonance, which the dissent of so many Evangelical Reformed Churches, in regard to the doctrine of the presence of the Lord in his Supper, creates. Not that this dissent should take away the joy arising from the consent in regard to the most important articles of the Christian, as well as of the specific evangelical faith with all Reformed Churches. No, we rather rejoice with gratitude at that preponderating agreement, as it was, notwithstanding this dissent, originally witnessed by the Reformed in their *consensus*, drawn up in 1529 at Marburg.\*



They also strove in its 15th article, concerning the Lord's Supper, to give prominence rather to that on which they agreed, than to that on which they differed; and as the relation is still essentially what it was then, it is only proper, that this most important article should stand at the head of our further discussion. It reads thus:†

*Concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.* Fifteenthly, all of us maintain and believe, concerning the Supper of our dear Lord Jesus Christ, that, according to Christ's institution, both kinds are to be received; likewise, that the Sacrament of the altar is also a Sacrament of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, and the spiritual partaking of this body and blood is especially needful to every Christian; further, that the use of the Sacrament, like the Word, was given and instituted by Almighty God, thereby to induce weak consciences to believe through the Holy Ghost. *And although we have at this time not agreed, as to whether the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are bodily present in the bread and wine, one part is nevertheless to exercise Christian charity toward the other, as far as each conscience will suffer them to do so, and both parties*

\*The insertion of the *consensus* in its fourteen articles, proceeding as it does from the Reformers themselves, is of very high authority. It has also passed over into the Augsburg Confession, which is of still greater importance to the Evangelical Church and to which the Reformed Churches of Germany have continued their adherence. To renew communion of confession to it, and thereby also designate it as a *formula consensus*, was one of the principal designs of the Conference held in Berlin in 1853. More recently Dr. J. Müller has published, both, separately and in his ample work, entitled, *The Evangelical Union, its Essence and Divine right*, Berlin, 1854. p. 170 ss., "a plan of agreement between the confessional documents of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, as recognized in the Evangelical Churches of Prussia." This carefully prepared plan possesses an undoubted theological value, which, however, falls away aside of the great historical and ecclesiastical authority of the authentic documents from the time of the Reformation, not having, of course, the strong force of an original witness. I can therefore also not attach such great weight to the opinions of the author, so as not to give the preference to the attempted annexation by Nitzsch, in the Records of the Union, of the consensus to the Augsburg Confession, which Müller also recognizes as a chief symbol of the Evangelical Church, taking at the same time the liberty of referring to my address on the Augustana at the Conference at Berlin.

†See Nitzsch's Record of the Evangelical Union, Bonn, 1853, page 6.

are earnestly to pray Almighty God, that he may through his Spirit confirm to us the correct understanding.

Martinus Luther,	Joannes Brentius,
Justus Jonas,	Joannes Oecolampadius,
Philippus Melanchthon,	Huldricus Zwinglius,
Andreas Osiander,	Martinus Bucerus,
Stephanus Agricola,	Caspar Hedio.

I bow reverently before these illustrious names, and cannot but acknowledge with my entire consent, that, as these Reformers have, in this and the other fourteen articles, stated truly and correctly their essential *consensus*, so also have they designated, in the clearest manner, the still remaining point of controversy between them. If on the part of the Reformed it has been conceded, that the sacrament of the altar is a sacrament of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, and on the part of the Lutherans, that the spiritual partaking of this body and blood is especially needful to every Christian; and again, on the part of the Reformed, that the use of the sacraments is designed to induce weak consciences to believe, and must, therefore, not pre-suppose their faith, everything is herein comprehended in which they had already come near to each other and, also, in which they afterwards, through Calvin's earnest endeavors, strove to approach each other still nearer. On this point, however, they never came to an agreement, namely, "that the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are bodily present in the bread and wine." This is maintained, though without assuming an inclusion of the essential presence of Christ in the bread and wine, only by the Lutherans. All Protestants who deny it, how different soever their other positive shades of opinion in regard to the Supper at the time of the Reformers were, or to this day may have continued to be, constitute, *in this*, a party which is regarded by the Lutheran orthodoxy as a heterodox opposition. There is, according to the fathers of the Lutheran Church and those who still desire to be classed among her sons, no middle party between this *yes* and *no*. The question, "whether the true body and blood of Christ are bodily (substantially) and objectively present in the bread and wine" is still an undecided question of controversy, and is either to be affirmed or denied. Should it be settled, all other differences might easily be arranged.

The fathers whilst determining, as we have seen, the point of controversy, have, at the same time imposed upon us a two-fold obligation. The first of these is, that each party exercise towards the other, as far as each conscience may permit, *Christian charity*. This obligation rests doubtless upon that *consensus* of their belief in the fundamental articles of Christian doctrine previously declared and established by them, and afterwards also received into the Augsburg Confession. Upon this common basis of Christian truth, *Christian charity* is to be mutually exercised. The question is not about that universal charity, which we owe to men in general, but about that *Christian charity*, which we owe to Christians united with us by a Confession which is nearly allied to our own. The clause "as far as each conscience ever will permit," neither sanctions the opposite of *Christian charity*, namely, hatred and animosity among those who are so nearly allied, nor is it satisfied with merely a minimum of it. It, on the contrary, sanctions, yea, requires the highest possible degree of it, and therefore desires it so much the more to be evinced by reciprocal exhibitions upon the broad basis of mutual conviction, as is evident from the fact that in the words, "and though we have at this time not agreed, whether," &c., employed in the very beginning, the hope of a future and complete agreement is cherished. Wherever the *nay* arrays itself in decided and expressed opposition against the *yea*, no perfect fraternal agreement can consequently take place, nor a celebration of the Supper in common be expected; yet it does not follow from this, that a cessation of all Christian and ecclesiastical communion must be inferred, as long as that *Christian charity* which, according to the *consensus* has been pledged, is actually observed. Accordingly the preface to the Book of Concord also demands for "the many pious people, who have thus far not come to an agreement with us in all things and who walk in singleness of heart, *Christian charity* and sympathy, when they must suffer persecution. This is "the spirit of moderation and liberality," which has also more recently been called for in the promotion of a conservative union.

How far the fathers and their descendants have or have not discharged that obligation regarding the exercise of mutual *Christian charity*, and how far it is at present discharged are different questions, which certainly admit of very different answers, and the answers again of different in-

terpretations. None, certainly will have any cause for boasting, but rather for humility, which confesses, how greatly both parties have erred, how far selfishness and doggedness have outweighed charity and justice and how greatly the conciliatory *consensus* has been undervalued on account of the one point of difference. The attempt has also not unfrequently been made to force the conscientious scruples of one in regard to the exercise of Christian charity as a law upon all, notwithstanding the Marburg *consensus* secures to each conscience the extent of its own liberty. It is by no means to be censured, that, in these latter times of general apostasy from Christianity and the obscurity in which it has been involved, the severed members of the body of Christ should, amid the returning light, have summoned each other to re-union, a union in love against their common evil enemy; and that especially in the decayed Evangelical Churches the love of union and the union of love has found, beside many equivocal, also not a few honest friends and a goodly number of influential promoters. And though much may have been omitted in this respect, in consequence of imperfect knowledge, charity must not, on that account, cease, and no conscience of an Evangelical Christian should mistake the duty to exercise reciprocal Christian charity, on the ground of the important points of agreement, still existing between them in their Confessions; and also mutually to manifest it by an ecclesiastical confederation in the promotion of common Christian objects and the opposition of common enemies, as well as in striving to bring about a perfect union in the true determination of points still undecided.

This leads us to the second obligation, which our fathers have enjoined on us in the Marburg *consensus*, and which is not to remain unaccomplished in this article, namely, that of both parties earnestly praying to Almighty God, that he may through his Spirit, confirm to us the correct understanding. This obligation is incumbent upon all Evangelical Christians, but more especially upon theologians, who above all others have been called to lay hold on the correct understanding of divine truth, in the fear of God, by prayer and meditation, combined with diligent study. The Holy Spirit for whom they are to pray, that he may confirm the correct understanding, is the spirit of *truth*, whom the Lord in that very night, in which he instituted the Supper and in which he exhorted them so urgently to love him as the light, re-



peatedly promised to his disciples as the light, which should guide them into all truth and glorify *him*. To this certainly belongs also more especially the gracious truth of his *words of the Supper*. So far as love is without truth, so far is it defective, uncertain and unusual, because determined more by its imagination than by its object. The most sacred calling of a theologian is, to defend the truth in love, and hence it remains, amid the efforts of Christian charity to promote a union, the irremissible duty of theological science to insist upon the "correct understanding" of the holy testament which the Lord bequeathed to his Church in the night before his death upon the cross. Even if it was true, what we dare not here concede, that the differences in question are of no importance as far as the spiritual life of the laity is concerned, theologians would still not be at liberty to disregard them, without contradicting their own character, which everywhere depends upon the correct understanding of the divine word. Difficult theological questions are according to the Formula of Concord (*de pecc. orig.* p. 65) not to be brought before the common people; nevertheless their determination is to the theologian of the utmost importance, and must not be set aside, either from motives of charity to those who may differ from us, or in consideration of our own indecision in regard to them. How much less ought this to be the case in regard to that question, which is of lasting importance to every partaker of the Holy Supper, and which, on account of its connection with the whole of Christology, possesses the deepest interest for the theologian and Christologian, namely, the question, whether the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are bodily in the bread and wine? To regard this question as one of indifference to theologians from motives of charity, or to esteem it of no account, whether it receives a negative or an affirmative answer, and to hold our own opinion in undecided suspense between the two, all this may be well intended, but such a well-meaning intention is far from being a true progress in theological science. Of this those friends of the union especially, who wish to be considered neither Lutheran nor Reformed, but of the *neutral gender*, will be able to boast so much the less, the less they have as yet succeeded in bringing about among themselves the clear and definite understanding and agreement in regard to controverted points arrived at, notwithstanding the fair promises given out by them to that effect.



Who should not esteem the believing and positive efforts for the consummation of a union of such men as Nitzsch and Müller, on the part of the Lutherans, as contrasted with those rationalistic unionists, whose "united church" so highly lauded, in well known papers of the day, has infinitely less affinity with the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, than these have with each other; and who does not also give the preference, by far, to the corresponding efforts of Ebrard and Schenkel, on the part of the Reformed, to those negative unionists? Heppe, indeed, goes further, who with considerable zeal and devotion to his views, which exhibit predominantly the character of *personality* and subjectivity, maintains that Melancthon deserves the credit of being the father of the *German Reformed*, or *old Protestant Church and old Protestant Union*, in sharp antagonism toward Luther,\* whom he charged with "the violation of the Protestant principle and a relative return to the Catholic stand-point, 1. inasmuch as Luther removed the sacramental mediation of salvation through the personal relation of the believer with Christ altogether (?) beyond the believer's soul, does not base it upon the indwelling of Christ in the believer, upon *Christ in him*, but builds it up upon an existence of Christ beyond the believer, upon an objective ubiquity (presence) of the body of Christ over against the believer, and 2. inasmuch as Luther again relapses altogether into the scholastic, external, material (?) contemplation of the *body* of Christ, which the Protestant consciousness cannot allow, because there appears in it no (?) essential (on the contrary a very essential) reference to the saving person of

\*The confessional development of the old Protestant Church of Germany, the old Protestant Union and the present confessional position and task of German Protestantism, by Dr. Heppe, Marburg, 1854. See especially p. 14, 17, 27. The author lays an excessively one-sided stress upon the (in the sinner very egotistical) personality, which, in dogmatics, has everywhere the essence or nature as its corollary, when he, p. 362, exclusively maintains, "the claim and truth of Protestantism indicates exclusively in the Divine right" which becomes the personality in the evangelical department. As regards Melancthon, whom the author, in a spirit of partiality, exalts at Luther's expense, I too have already in my professional inaugural at Marburg in 1821, directed attention to him as a promoter of a union in the faith; *symbolam ad providendam unionem ecclesiarum evangelicarum una cum egregio Calvini pro Melancthone testimonio dedit, E. Sartorius*. Much, however, as I honor Melancthon, and much as I am indebted to him, I can nevertheless not permit him to be separated from his great pupil and commentator Chemnitz, who was just as learned and far more consistent than he.

Christ (which is yet inseparable from its essence). Apart from the credit that may be attached to Melanchthon, who certainly did not sustain the same relation to Luther as Hefpe supposes, the fundamental view of the latter on Protestantism appears to amount essentially to what Luther, in his clear perception justly denominates, "spiritual fanaticism" (*Schwarmgeisterei*), because it dissolves the *inner subjective* "life of salvation" of the Christian from the *objective* determination and mediation through the "means of salvation" of the Church, and instead of establishing Christ in us upon Christ beyond and for us, rather attempts to invert the relation, and with it the order of salvation. Surely from such a "German Reformed" tendency Melanchthon was very far, and it may also be presumed, that Nitzsch and Müller will also never favor such a severe opposition to Luther,\* and understand and interpret both Melanchthon's position and views in reference to the Holy Sacrament in a manner essentially different. So long, however, as these esteemed theologians do not set forth a more comprehensive and distinct statement of their opinions concerning the Holy Supper, than has hitherto been done by them, they cannot nor will they according to the sketches† they have given, wish to be classed among those, who espouse the negative of the question, which the Marburg *consensus* has left still open to debate, namely, whether the true body and blood of Christ are essentially in the bread and wine. All those who, in opposition to the Lutheran fathers negate the question, are without prejudice to the different values of their positive views, not indeed in a contracted sense Zwinglian, but in a more extensive and recognizable sense *Reformed*, an appellation which, in a historical point of view, signifies more than "united."

\*Compare Nitzsch *Urkundenbuch der Union*. Preface p. viii.

†J. Müller, the Evangelical Union, p. 308, where he speaks of "the Holy Supper and the communication of the divine attributes to the human nature of Christ," chooses between an "either very comprehensive or *very short*" treatment of these articles, the latter. The dissenting views, to which belong not only the Lutheran peculiarities, but also the entire doctrine of the Church, concerning the *communio naturarum et communicatio idiomatum*, whose "entire ballast of forms" is to be "cast over board," exhibit a stand-point, which has its place still beyond the *consensus* and dissent of the churches in private theology. At all events, even mere ballast should not be cast over board, till a more valuable cargo has first been received, inasmuch as the theological ship might otherwise become too light and capsize too easily.

Accordingly all the Reformed of whatever shade, united or otherwise, deny—this is the *status controversiæ*—that the true body and blood of Jesus Christ is bodily in the bread and wine, and with this they also necessarily deny, that he is received bodily, *i. e.* with the mouth of the body or orally, inasmuch as they ascribe the reception *only* to the mouth of the spirit, or to faith. All we have before said contains already the reasons, why the Lutheran orthodoxy must return an affirmative answer to both these Reformed negatives. On the part of the Reformed is maintained only the spiritual partaking, on our part, by no means in a one-sided contradiction, only the bodily, but both the spiritual and bodily, regarding especially “the spiritual partaking necessary;” both, however, exclude each other as little, as do soul and body, which in the living man are always organically combined, and passing over into one another, mutually condition each other. As the body sees and hears by means of the soul, so does the soul by means of the body, and to each external there is a corresponding internal sense and the converse. Now as the eye and ear of the spirit do not shut out the eye and ear of the body, but rather hears or reads by means of these organs the word of the Holy Ghost, whereby the believing soul is saved, so also does the mouth of the spirit or of faith not shut out the mouth of the body, but also receives through it that which inspires the heart with confidence, and comforts and blesses the inner man. If even our daily bread, our bodily nourishment possesses something which strengthens and makes glad the heart of man (Ps. 104: 15), in consequence of the living union between the body and soul, should not so much the more the heavenly bread, the bread of life, *orally* received in the sacrament, be a living food for the entire inner man? Is not the tongue of the mouth a little member and yet does great things, and is not the mouth the organ of the word and of prayer which moves and affects the soul? Is not the kiss of the mouth a pledge of love which gladdens the heart (Song 1: 1)? Does not the mouth speak out of the fulness of the heart? If the means of grace affect the heart through the eye and ear,\* who dare maintain, that this may not also be done

\*See *Apology de numero et usu sacramentorum*, p. 200, *Corda simul per verbum et ritum movet Deus, ut credant et concipiant fidem; sicut autem verbum incurrit in aures, ut feriat corda, ita ritus incurrit in oculis, ut moveat corda.* See also Luther W. vol. XX. p.

through the mouth? or that it is too base for it? Who dare venture to maintain this, in opposition to the word of the Lord, Take, *eat*, this is my body; take, *drink*, this is my blood? If he, the God-man gives us to kiss and taste in bread and wine the most delicate essence of his body and the glorified Ichor (Divine blood) of his blood, who dare hinder him? Who should not rather be enraptured at it?\*. It is true the natural or animal sense does not taste how holy and sweet it is, but the higher sense of the Christian does.

According to the Marburg articles, we agree that the sacrament of the altar is a sacrament of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ; hence we also agree, that it is not a mere (*nudum*) sign or symbol of it, but also a pledging of his body; we agree that it is connected with an offering and communication of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.† But we do not yet agree, nor can we agree in this, that the communication to the spirit or the believing soul takes place, not in the means of grace through the organ of the mouth, but apart from these and *immediately*, though simultaneously with the presentation of the external signs, whereat then only the Holy Ghost is (without means) the mediator, “who exalts the soul and brings down to it the body of Christ.‡ It cannot bring us essentially nearer the point, by uniting this immediate sacramental communicating activity of the Holy Spirit and the presence of Christ attached to it

1046: “The mouth is for the heart bodily and the heart for the mouth spiritually.” The heart believes what the mouth receives, just as it believes what the ear hears, and as the spirit understands what the eye sees. *Corde credatur, quod ore sumitur; Leo M.*

\*Compare *Mysteriosophia, seu doctrina de Sacramentis Ecclesiar. tractata a Joh. Conr. Dannkauer. Argentorati 1646, Sec. II. Art. 4. §83: Ingens amoris argumentum est, mortem pro alio subire: sed habet exempla; grandius, proprio lacte potare, quos amamus; id matres faciunt ordinarie, extra ordinem patrem sic pavit Cononis filia; sed corpore proprio pascere, quem amas, sanguine lactare, a quo amari velis, hic ipsissimus amor est; altius ire nequit. Indicet orbis Christianus, an leve sit, quod in mandacatione tuemur. It is done communicatione vera sed non fera. See §82. ib.*

†See Müller, the Evangelical Union, in the place of agreement, Art. 21, concerning the Holy Supper, p. 199.

‡So Nitzsch (Urkundenbuch der Union, p. 52 or Streitschrift gegen Kahnis, p. 53) with Calvin, whom he according to this even corrects, by moderating his (somewhat imperious, Rom. 10: 6) *clearare oculos et animum in celos transcendere mundum* by the Divine *descendere* of the Holy Spirit and of Christ.



with the sacramental *act* (*cum actu*) in point of time\* whilst it remains, according to its essence, separated from the earthly elements, with which the act is performed, and to which the word of the Lord concerning his body and blood is directed. Even supposing we conceive of the bodily and spiritual communication at one and the same time as parallel, we are still aware, that even the closest parallels never touch each other, but are always beside, but never in each other. There remains therefore that hazardous separation of the heavenly blessing from the earthly means, which is so incongruous with the organical connection between the body and the soul, and which, as a natural consequence must lead to a similar separation among other means of grace, and with it to a degradation of their efficacy and truth, and establish that fatal distinction between *voluntas signi* and *voluntas beneplaciti*, which forms the dark basis of the secret absolution of the doctrine of predestination.† Consistency would require us to close also the bodily ear and eye as well as the mouth to the communication of spiritual blessings in heavenly treasures, which takes place through the means of grace, in, with or under the oral, written and visible word, and ex-

\*The *presentia actus in actu, non vero substantia in substantia*, is particularly urged by Ebrard in the dogma of the Holy Supper.

†The contradictions which have recently been repeatedly charged upon the article on predestination in the Formula of Concord have in their connection with the doctrine concerning the means of grace, whose use, as far as they are *external* appointments of God, depends upon the free will, been long since in substance certainly correctly explained, by Aegidius Hunnius in his work *De providentia Dei et æterna prædestinatione*. The reply by J. Müller (the Evangelical Union, p. 282 ss.) mistakes the connection of the *pedagogical act* of grace with the pedagogical efficacy of the *law* which has also been written upon the heart of the old man, which certainly produced a very passive susceptibility or rather need of salvation, which essentially consists in an alarming sense of the *suffering from sin*, which by itself would invariably lead only to death, but never to life, if the totally unmerited operation of the grace of the *gospel* which anticipates every co-operation did not interpose. The old man can indeed feel within himself a burning thirst, but he is not able to quench it with a single drop of his own, Luke 16: 24. The liberty in *rebus rationi subjectis*, which the Augsburg Confession ascribes to the will of man in Art. 18, is already recognized by Luther in his work against Erasmus on the bondage of the will, W. vol. XVIII. p. 2129, 2201, and that the operations of grace are performed only through the means of grace, but not without them secretly, irresistibly, has always been Lutheran doctrine. Compare furthermore Schneckenburger, on the two-fold state of Christ, p. 85 and 136 ss.



pect everything through immediate inspiration, which would very soon produce the most extravagant spiritual fanaticism. We thank God, that the Reformed Church which was originally exposed to fierce agitations and fanatical extravagancies, has through prudent moderation been finally secured against those extremes. Nevertheless we cannot suppress an apprehension, which has been expressed even on the part of the Reformed: "The incapacity to recognize the sacrament as an objective representation addressed to the spiritual sense as the real manifestation of Divine love, threatens more especially Reformed Protestantism with the danger of mistaking altogether the theological signification of the sacrament and of falling back, in this respect, upon the one-sided subjective stand-point of the *radical opposition*. Thus says Dr. Schenkel in his *essence of Protestantism*, vol I. p. 412.

If according to this we cannot consent to the separation of the oral and the spiritual partaking in the Supper on account of the means of grace; then we can certainly also not consent to it on account of man the recipient, who is an undivided *pneumato-somatic* being, and for whose sake the Son of God became flesh of his flesh. It is spiritualistic one-sidedness, which confines redemption only to the soul of man; whilst it concerns the whole man, who consists of body and soul, which during this earthly life, to which he is called, are inseparably joined to a personal unity (*unio personalis*), and therefore also interwoven with each other to a living communion (*communio*) and reciprocal communication (*communicatio et participatio*, giving and receiving). It is well known, that this intimate union has often been employed by the Church teachers, as an analogy of the personal union and communion of the divine and human nature in Christ. Although the distinction is not to be ignored, and there is especial need of guarding against Apollinaristic inferences, yet their affinity dares also not be ignored. There is a dualistic conception of this relation which is very much inclined, in unmistakable agreement with the corresponding Christological view, to regard the communication of the body and soul and their manifestations more as merely *nominal* than *real*, and according to this, if any attribute of the soul, such as activity or passiveness, is predicated of the entire person and consequently also of the body or its members, or conversely, a bodily one of the person and consequently also of the soul or its faculties, it is to be regarded only as a

(Zwinglian) *alloyosis* or changing of names. A more thorough anthropology must contradict all this, and just as distinctively as the Holy Scriptures distinguish, in contradistinction to a sensual materialism, between body and soul, flesh and spirit, just so decidedly are they also opposed to every separation which they either place (as tending to Manichæism) as incongruous substances which exclude each other, or in collateral (occasional) union are only beside each other, without their life, activity and suffering passing communicatively over into each other. The substance of the body is indeed earth, and the essence of the soul is the divine breath of life, but which animates the body in such a way, that the whole man is designated as a living soul (Gen. 2: 7) and again the same man, in as far as the spirit ministers to the body, is designated also as flesh, and conversely, the body, when it is sanctified and glorified through the Lord and his Spirit, as the temple of the Holy Ghost and a spiritual body. Hereby the anthropological ideas concerning heart and sense, feeling and impulse, soul, life and love are so double-sided, reaching down so deep into the animal and up so high into the spiritual, and passing without any fixed limits in fluctuating gradations so multifariously in, over and under each other, that there can be no question whatever concerning an only local and temporally confined separate, or a mere co-existence of the body and soul. Whatever is spiritual is mediated to the *pneumato-somatic* man through bodily means and whatever is bodily is influenced by spiritual *realii*; a simultaneous partaking, partly merely sensual (animal) and partly *merely* super-sensual (angelic), is opposed to all analogy of the Scriptures and psychological experience, and can, therefore, also not be admitted in the sacrament, to the idea of which *the union of the sensuous and super-sensuous* appertains.

This cannot be admitted so much the more, because both the Saviour as well as the means of salvation design the healing of the *whole* man, who is diseased in soul and body by sin. The Son of God has assumed the whole man, the whole human nature, with soul and body, flesh and blood (Heb. 2: 14), not in order to use it merely as a temporary form of manifestation, but to redeem, heal and sanctify it wholly. After he had rendered satisfaction and finished its sanctification in himself to perfect righteousness, transfigured and glorified its essence to glory, it could only be his loving design to communicate the fulness of the salvation of his

human essence to sinful man in such a way, that his whole life, his spirit, soul and body (1 Thes. 5 : 23) would thereby be redeemed from the curse of sin and be renewed and sanctified. It has already been shown, in the former part of these meditations on the holy communion, how, according to the type of the first Adam in the anti-type of the second, the assumption of the whole human essence for the purpose of renewing it, the communication of it must corresponds with the humanity to be renewed, whereby the body dare so much the less be overlooked, the more it has also been corrupted by sin. This assertion is opposed by a restricting denial, on the part of those, who partly by altogether losing sight of the communication of the essence of Christ, restrict themselves only to the reception of the spiritual benefits of his temporal life and sufferings, and partly by insisting, that every higher communication of life is exclusively designed for the soul and only mediated through the Holy Ghost, whose influence accompanies the use of the means of grace, as an externally confirmatory parallel. This restriction, however, which, refuses to the human body the sanctifying influence of the Divine-human body, in that it denies its oral reception, we must reject. It leads to an unlawful degradation of the human body, which the Sacred Scriptures represent as dedicated, as a living temple to God, 1 Cor. 6 : 19 s. This was its original design, for man has been created in the image of God, and of this holy image was the body of man to be the consecrated temple, just as Christ also speaks of the temple of his body, John 2 : 21. But since man by his apostasy from God has fallen into idolatry and changed the Divine image within him into an idol, (Rom. 1 : 23 s), his body has also become more and more polluted and debased, especially through the sins of the flesh and blood, which are inordinate desires, intemperance, uncleanness and carnality of every kind, which stands connected with idolatry in various ways, and is also physically connected with the transmission of original sin. How incomplete would redemption be, if it did not also design and accomplish the redemption of our body (Rom. 8 : 23). This it accomplishes both by the Son of God having in the flesh also rendered satisfaction for the sins of the flesh and taking upon himself on the cross its ancient curse, and by communicating the new and sanctified essence of his flesh and blood to us, and by putting our body into communion with it, so that we become with him not only one spirit, but also one

flesh (compare 1 Cor. 6: 17 and Eph. 3: 30 s). This is done not only by our spirit immediately receiving his spirit and body, but also by our body being made partaker of his body, and that as in the way prescribed in the Supper, in the words, Take, *eat*, this is my body, namely, *orally*. Thus the *whole* man receives the *whole* Christ essentially according to both natures, and through him becomes wholly pardoned and sanctified. He receives him with the sensuous mouth in the orally sensuous sacrament, because it is in this way that his *sensuous* nature too, is to be sanctified,\* of which it stands the more in need, the more sinful it is. Not as if it was, as Manicheal and monkish ascetism imagines, sinful and objectionable according to its *substance*, and therefore only to be suppressed and destroyed by the spirit, which leads to that puffed up sanctimoniousness, which Paul denounces, Col. 2: 18-23. No, only according to its present *condition* is it unhealthy, polluted and impure, through the distemper of sin, and therefore even where it still blooms in beauty, it is nevertheless already infected with the poison of the malady, which also touches especially out of the heart the lustful lips, and influences the tongue which is as poisonous as it is unruly, James 3: 8. Now as unholy spirituality can only be healed and sanctified through holy spirituality, so also can an unholy bodily nature only be healed and sanctified through a holy bodily nature, and on this account is it so salutary, that the impure lips (Isaiah 6: 5) and the soul of the mouth, the unruly tongue are touched and consecrated, in the Holy Supper, by the pure ether of life of the body and blood of Christ, which also exerts a sanctifying influence upon the whole heart.

The Scriptures bear witness, how the heart or love is everywhere the fountain of life. Out of a holy love flows a holy life, out of an unholy love an unholy life, out of a sinful love a sinful life, and if according to Augustine, virtue is the regulation of love, sin must be the disorder of it. In what irregularities love has been thrown, that of the male as well as of the female, how idolatrous, selfish and carnal it has become, how deeply it has fallen and degenerated from the Divine elevation down into the very filth of the earth, is exhibited in the history of the children of Adam only too pain-

\*Compare the interesting work on the essence of the Holy Supper by Theodore Schwarz, Greifswald 1825. page 97 ss. and page 168 ss.



fully, if we look upon the moral desolations that have been wrought in every department of life by it. Who is the physician, and where is the remedy for the mortally diseased, love of sinners of both sexes, tormented as it is by an evil conscience? God himself is love, holy love, and in order to seek and save his lost children upon the earth from an impure death, has he become man, a pure and holy man, of the Virgin Mary, an incarnation of love, which is not merely divine, but Divinity itself. This incarnation of the most exalted and pure love is also to be incarnated to our diseased flesh, so that its evil conscience may become good through grace, and itself become pure through the purity of the indwelling essence of Christ. It is only the purest love which purifies the impure love of the flesh and blood; and what more cordial self-sacrificing proof of this could he give to us, than this very engrafting of the pure essence of his glorified flesh and blood in our own. Let us only remember what the Lord himself says, with so much impressiveness, in reference to this meat and drink in John 6. It is no poetical fancy, but a scriptural truth, that the God-man is the holy bridegroom (John 3: 29) and heavenly spouse of his church on earth, which he loves as his own body and with which he consequently also sustains a bodily union, which is full of deep mysteries, but on that account none the less, one of essence. The Apostle Paul, Eph. 5: 25-31, makes on this point, with reference to both sacraments, the most fruitful application to the sanctity of the connubial relation and with it to the entire sexual character of man, which has become so depraved by sin, but which is to be again ennobled by Christ. The Holy Supper, as the Lord's holy kiss of love and holy marriage with him according to soul and body, operates effectually for their sanctification in purity and modesty, which are *pneumato-somatic* virtues. The first Epistle to the Corinthians in which the Apostle treats repeatedly of the Lord's Supper (ch. 11: 23 ss.; 10: 16 ss. and also in allusion 5: 7 s.), is evidently connected with it and at the same time abounds in the most impressive exhortations to modesty and purity and against lasciviousness; the Apostle knows of no stronger argument against it, than that we are also bodily the members of Christ, and that the body is not for fornication but for the Lord, and *the Lord also for the body*, which thereby has conferred on it a holy nobility, ch. 6: 13-20. It is also not without connection, that shortly before the principal passage concerning the Supper in ch. 11, the Apos-



He doubtless with a view to restrain Corinthian frivolity urges very strenuously upon the women the duty of appearing in Christian assemblies dressed especially in chaste and modest apparel, censuring at the same time more particularly the want in all of temperance in eating and drinking. All this calls to mind the question: Who received such a sacrament worthily? Fasting and bodily preparation are indeed a good external discipline. As such it would, of course, possess no spiritual benefit, but be defective, if entered upon in the sense of a self-righteous asceticism, and in the illusion of its being meritorious. But whereas there is present in the heart of the Christian true faith in the declaration of love "for you, for thee," how should he there not also hold his own body susceptible *for Him*, for the reception of his holy body, and prepare it in a wholesome self-denying discipline, which is salutary as an asceticism of love for soul and body, and answers to the pure and exalted communion with Christ. This is also the object of repentance and confession before communion.

From these considerations it already sufficiently follows, what a holy signification for the temporal life of the Christian, the bodily partaking of the body of his Saviour possesses, and why we cannot on any account admit, that the mouth partakes in the Sacrament only of dry bread and natural wine, whilst the communication of the heavenly benefit passes it by and immediately insinuates itself into the soul. We are not afraid of the objection urged on physical grounds, that, whatever enters the mouth is either assimilated to the natural substance of the body or separated from it. A noble scion ingrafted in the life of a wild tree is by no means changed into its nature, but rather assimilates its sap and strength and changes them into a noble fruit. In like manner is the exalted substance of the holy and glorified body and blood of Christ not to be assimilated to our ignoble and sinful substance, nor will it be, but ours is to be lovingly assimilated to his,\* is to become through his influence and indwelling like unto his own glorified body (Phil. 3: 21), and will become so, if man does not in self-hness, unbelief and unkindness reject it. Indeed the Lord testifies, that he is glorified in his people, John 17: 10; the Lord's glory is

\*For we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones, Eph. 5: 30. Compare Luther W. vol. XX. p. 1054. To this also belongs *sis quod sumis*.

reflected by them, and they are glorified with an increasing glory in his image, 2 Cor. 3: 18, which in a Christian, sanctified in soul and body, may be perceived already even here in his whole life and by the tender and precious fruit he bears, notwithstanding his true life is still a hidden one. Not as if all this was effected only through the Lord and not also through his Spirit. Such a separation is unknown to us, who know full well, how the Apostle in the passage, just cited, calls Christ himself the Spirit, without, however, separating him thereby from his glorified body after which he will fashion our own vile body, according to the working (*ἐνεργεία*) whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself. Phil. 3: 21. It is only that separation of the Spirit from the body of Christ which we throughout oppose in common with the Scriptures and with Luther which, with a reference to John 6, calls the flesh of Christ, which is glorified by his Divinity, a "spirit flesh," and which therefore also gives to man in and after that death which proceeds from the flesh of Adam, eternal life. We have already seen above, in the examination of our Lord's discourse in John 6, how this immortal life is of advantage to the undying soul as its higher corporality already immediately after the bodily death, and how it then also, at the coming of the Lord in his glory for the resurrection of the dead, mediates the re-union of the soul with its resurrection body. For when Christ, who is their life, shall appear, the dead, whose life has, till then, been hid with Christ in God, shall also appear with him in glory. Col. 3: 3, 4. The living pledge of this future glorious transfiguration is the communication of the glorified body and blood of Christ in the holy communion, whose reception (*manducatio*) takes place orally and whose saving enjoyment (*fruitio*) takes place spiritually by faith.

A necessary consequence of the denial of the oral reception of the body and blood of Christ, in the Holy Supper, is the negation, that *all* communicants, and therefore also the *unbelieving* part of them, received him, and that these can accordingly be called communicants only in an improper sense. In this negation, too, the Reformed of every shade, down to the Unionists, agree in opposition to the Lutherans. True, all who approach nearer the Lutheran orthodoxy from Calvin down, do not desire to make the offering (*oblatio*) of the gift of grace, tendered by the Lord, dependent on faith, and therefore allow, that it is also received by unbelieving or unworthy communicants: but they also deny the undivided

impartation (*collatio*) and acceptation on their part, because unbelief rejects the offering, and they regard faith of the spirit the only organ of reception, rejecting altogether the external sense as the mediating organ. It is self-evident from what we assert of the essential presence and its oral reception, that all to whom the consecrated bread and wine are offered, consequently also such as are destitute of true faith, receive in them the body and blood of the Lord. This we affirm in opposition to those who deny it so much the more decidedly, because the denial concedes the question to unbelievers, by confirming them in their unbelieving notion, that there are received in the Holy Supper nothing but empty signs, nothing but bread and wine. Now, we ask, are those who do not believe, be it from ignorance, weakness or stubbornness, to be brought to the belief, that they receive, in the sacrament or with it, the body and blood of the Lord, if it were true, that those who do not believe, do not receive them. Rather must the falsity of their unbelief and the opposite truth, namely, that all participants, be they believing or unbelieving, receive in it the same contents, be maintained so much the more firmly, so that they may believe. According to the Marburg *consensus* it has been mutually admitted, that the use of the sacrament had been appointed by God, "as a means to excite weak consciences to faith," an admission to which also Calvin and the later Reformed Confessions have consented.\* But how can this be done, if those consciences, which are as yet too weak or too timid to believe in the magnitude of the gift of grace offered in the sacrament, must hear, that it is just on this account, that they receive nothing of it? This will only confirm them in their unbelief or increase their timidity, although they stand most in need of faith and confidence. To say, that such unbelief, arising from weakness, is still yet a weak faith, possesses at least the will to believe and must therefore be distinguished from confirmed unbelief, which alone is sent away empty in the sacrament, leads us inevitably to proportion the measure of the gift to be received according to the measure of faith, which is to receive it. Now since the degree of faith (of *fides quae* as well as *qua creditur*) is certainly very different in communicants, the object of salvation to be received would, accordingly have to graduate itself very differently, yea, would in many instances have to be

\*See J. Müller, The Evangelical Union, p. 196 s.

divided into fragmentary parts, inasmuch as many would consider or believe themselves obliged to appropriate to themselves in the Holy Supper, only one or the other part of Christ's merits. How can after this still be maintained the objective truth of the sacramental contents, which is intended to be maintained, if in its reception it is to be continually either increased or diminished according to the large or small capacity of the subjective faith, or if unbelief is so powerful as to falsify the word of the Lord, "*Take, eat, (i. e. receive orally), this is my body.*" The further inference could then also not be avoided, namely, that, while Christian faith is, in general, very different among Christians, Christ ceases to be everywhere among them the same Christ, which he nevertheless remains, how much soever he may be ignored.

If the subject is not everywhere to have the control over the object, it must in no wise be conceded, that that which is to be believed or received, is to be proportioned according to the degree of faith which is to receive it, because, if such a concession be made, rationalism will only too readily draw its miserable inference, that nothing is to be believed, except what our limited reason is able to comprehend, in opposition to the well-known and beautiful sentiment of Bacon: *Mysteria non coarctentur ad angustias animi, sed angustiae animi dilatentur ad amplitudinem mysteriorum.* Into what a minimum must holy baptism shrivel, if we would proportion that which the child receives in it according to the degree of its faith, which analogous to its mental capacity can in general scarcely be more than a susceptibility and need of faith, or a dormant faith which, when it awakens to consciousness and perceives what it has slumberingly received, Ps. 127: 2, does then not doubt the evidence of things not seen. Heb. 11: 1. Surely, to the little children belongs already the great kingdom of heaven, and the newborn babe also receives immediately such an abundance of paternal and maternal love, which far exceeds in magnitude its little heart; and although it is not yet capable of appreciating its blessings, but is under tutors and governors, so that it does not differ from a servant, it is nevertheless already *Lord of all*, and will in time become conscious of its goodness and worth, Gal. 4: 1 s. One must first be apprehended of Christ before he can apprehend him by faith, Phil. 3: 12. Existence always precedes consciousness and continues also when this becomes obscured, the being



precedes the knowledge of it; truth precedes faith in it, and food precedes its participation; faith is the internal participation of the sacramental food, whose reception it presupposes. *Ita attendum est sacramentis ut fides accedat*, says the Augsburg Confession, not *fides precedat*, and even though faith already precedes and accompanies, it rests upon the means of grace of the word, and receives confirmatory increase through the sacrament of the covenant, but this not through it. And though faith may be *minus*, it can still become *plus* through the *plus* of the sacrament, should, however, this through the minus of faith also become minus, then, of course, all is over.

It is clearly recorded concerning the types of the sacrament, that all the Israelites under the cloud did eat the same spiritual food and did all drink the same spiritual drink, though God was not well pleased with many of them, who in consequence of their unworthiness were overthrown in the wilderness, 1 Cor. 10: 3-5 ss. The connection in which this stands, in this and the following chapter with the instructions of the Apostle in regard to the Holy Supper, furnishes indubitable proof, that all communicants, consequently also those who are unworthy and with whom God is not well pleased do nevertheless receive the same food and the same drink, namely the body and blood of the Lord. The Apostle speaks of this matter so clearly, that we must either admit it, or give up altogether the perspicuity of the Holy Scriptures. In the tenth chapter he warns against all and every profanation of the holy communion, similar to those practiced in ancient times, and more especially against such as are occasioned by a participation in the feasts of the sacrifice of the Gentiles, because they place the Christian, who has entered through the Supper into an essential communion with Christ into a similar communion with the sacrifices offered to idols. In chapter 11 he continues his warnings against the desecrations, which are occasioned by Christians, not distinguishing properly between the Holy Supper and the common social Christian feasts. In order to give especial prominence to this difference, he cites the words of institution which he had received from the Lord, and in which the principal words are those of the Lord himself, who declares concerning the consecrated bread, that it is his body, and concerning the cup, that it is the cup of the covenant in his blood. The essential difference, therefore, between the Supper of the Lord (*ca. x. c. 17-20*) and



feasts which men make among themselves (*ἰδοὺ δειπνοῖ*) 1 Cor. 11: 20 ss. consists in this, namely, that the food and drink which is to be partaken of in the former, is the body and blood of the Lord. Hence it is also, that Paul declares immediately after the words of institution v. 27, that whosoever eats unworthily of *this* bread, which is the body of the Lord (*per zoocrontar*), and drinks of *this* cup, which contains the blood of the covenant of the Lord, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and further in v. 29 he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself because he does not discern the Lord's body, which he eats in the bread, from the common food, imagining in his unbelief that he receives nothing but bread and wine. If he were correct in this, he would not then be culpable and eat and drink in such ordinary food of which he partakes condemnation to himself; but if this be incorrect, as it undoubtedly is, then it follows, that he eats and drinks condemnation to himself, because that very thing which he receives also condemns him. It condemns him, because it is not inanimate bread, but bread of life, the bread of Christ, which resists everything incompatible with it, and will not permit itself to be assimilated to it in love. From it goes out the repelling influence simultaneous with that which assimilates. It effects the eternal life of man also by re-acting against whatever is diseased and corrupt, and especially also against unbelief, and chastises and corrects whatever is sinful and disordered in him, in order to purify and heal it, and thus save him from eternal destruction. So also the Holy Ghost, whom the Son sends from the Father, does not merely comfort the congregation of his believers, but also reproves the *world* of sin, because they believe not on him, and of righteousness, that the prince of this world may be judged, John 16: 8-11. Analogous to this Divine activity outside of the Church is that efficiency of his *pneumato-somatic* indwelling within her, relative to faint-hearted, impenitent and unbelieving Christians, who still approach the table of the Lord, and both profess as well as receive him with the mouth, also one of warning, reproof and condemnation. Indeed everywhere, where Christ is not received as the Redeemer he condemns, and is just as certainly the propitiation of all, who submit themselves to him, as he is the judge of all who resist him, and that both with as much magnanimity as forbearance.

Herewith falls to the ground the objection which has recently been urged with special emphasis\* against the reception essentially alike by *all* communicants, as if the substance of Christ's sacred body would thereby be degraded in the unbelieving into something without life, into a "passive substance," which produces no other effect, than to bring upon the participant, at last, the eternal punishment of death. It is altogether at variance with Paul's main discourse on unworthy participation, that the condemnation which accompanies it, should already be the final judgment and eternal damnation. On the contrary the Apostle declares expressly v. 32, when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. This salutary judging and chastising affects the frivolous and worldly-minded communicants the more sensibly, the more they had previously neglected to judge and discipline themselves; for if we would judge ourselves and after that observe strict discipline over our souls and bodies, we should not be judged v. 31. How full of peace, how salutarious and how reviving is the partaking of the Lord's body and blood to the believer, after having judged his own righteousness in self-denying humility and repentance and condemned all that yet remains in him of the old Adam, till he finds nothing within himself but a hungering and thirsting after the righteousness, love and life of his Saviour, who then comes full of grace with salvation to his house, to enter with the holy bread and wine into the narrow door of his tabernacle, so that both soul and body may rejoice in the living God, and become whole and holy in the most holy Divine-human communion. But how different is it, when Christ is indeed received, but heterodoxly mistaken, or without believing confidence not permitted to enter into the inner sanctuary of the earthly tabernacle, the heart; or when he finds body and soul in an undisciplined and unprepared state! There arises no peace, but desquietude, perplexity, confusion and also condemnation, or when self-conceited security and self-righteousness resist, there the opposition is increased and the accountability becomes greater for all, who, notwithstanding the means of salvation, remain unrelieved of their sores and sins; for it is without doubt, that the accountability of the Christian increases with the gifts he receives, and the more grace he disdainfully rejects, the more condemnation and chastise-

\*Compare J. Müller, *The Evangelical Union*, p. 308-310.

ment he heaps upon himself. Hence it is not on any account to be apprehended, that our, or rather the Pauline doctrine concerning unworthy participants promotes moral laxity. But on the contrary, if in any case the worth of the sacrament should be conditioned by the worthiness of the communicant, Pelagian inferences, which are everything but salutary, would forthwith have to be apprehended. It is intimately connected with what we above remarked, regarding the salutary influence of the Holy Supper also on the purity of the body, that the chastisement of unworthy communicants affects not only their souls, but also their disordered bodies, which would doubtless be in a more healthy condition if they were more pure. To this the Apostle also calls special attention by a reference to his former earnest warnings, when he says v. 30 s. for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep, for if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. That, however such judgment is not yet the judgment of damnation, but forms still a part of what belongs to paternal chastisements, though severe, which aim at the preservation of the soul, is evidenced by him in v. 32 just alluded to, and then concludes his warnings against an unworthy participation in the Holy Supper and against confounding it with common meals by saying, v. 34, if any man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation. And the rest will I *set in order* when I come. To exclude wilful sinners, sinners who give offence, who trample the Son of God under their feet, who count the blood of the covenant an unclean thing, and for whom remains a fearful looking for of judgment (Heb. 10: 26-29) from the holy communion, belongs to the order of Church discipline, the relaxing and discontinuance of which, during these times of the great apostasy through which we must pass, is deeply to be regretted. The betrayer of Jesus must be banished from the communion of his disciples. Wherever heretical sects sever the communion of the Church and do not celebrate the Lord's Supper according to his appointment, but only imitate a semblance of it, and also do not invoke his gracious presence, there is it also not to be participated in, nor does he hold communion with them.

It is still in accordance with the discipline of the Church, that neither the unbaptized, nor catechumens, nor such as have not confessed, i. e. notoriously impenitent and unab-solved persons, are admitted to the Holy Supper. Whoever,

refusing to accept Christ's wedding garment, comes in his own filthy robe of the flesh, should be debarred. We are not to come together unto condemnation, but to receive a benediction, not to be chastised and cast down, but to be pardoned and blessed through the deep condescension of the compassion and glory of the Lord, who comes to us with his Word, Spirit and body, enters through the doors of the senses, through the ear, eye and mouth to make his abode in us, to dwell in our hearts by *faith*, so that we being rooted and grounded by love in him, may be able to comprehend his depth and height, and through the plenteousness of his love be filled with all the fulness of God (Eph. 3: 14-19). Hence faith is most undoubtedly the first requisite to a saving enjoyment (*fruit*) of the sacrament and to the production of that holy effect, to which Paul alludes in the words: I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me (Gal. 2: 20), and who in the Holy Supper gives himself with body and soul to us as our own, and therewith all things (Rom. 8: 32), whatsoever we need for our salvation, reconciliation, forgiveness of sins, life and blessedness. Faith alone apprehends this gracious love which embraces and permeates the whole man, in as much as he is apprehended by this love, and yields himself confidently to its holy drawing, and thus tastes how gracious the Lord is, and how blessed it is thus to be loved by him, and again to love him with all the heart, soul and mind. Faith is also already necessary, because, though the species and contents of the sacrament are orally partaken of, the contents are yet perceived by the ear alone, and not by any of the other senses, and are in so far supersensuous, without however ceasing to be substantial, just as what we do not see in darkness, is still on that account not absent. John 20: 29; 1 Kings 8: 12. Thus it is certain that, whilst we maintain the objective similarity of the oral sacramental participation for all, the unworthy communicants included, nothing is thereby intended to be derogated from faith as the spiritual participation: but on the contrary, the former is maintained, that the absolute importance, reality and dignity of the sacrament may so much the more excite to faith and to a worthy preparation, and prevent the more effectually the unworthy partaking. Moreover, the inferences which we so unyieldingly prosecute are not merely drawn by



ourselves, but we adhere to them in view of the compassion of the Lord, who sat down at meat with poor and worthless sinners, Matt. 9: 10-13; Luke 14: 16 ss., and because they are based on the express teachings of the Scriptures, according to the Apostle Paul concerning those who eat and drink unworthily. Herein we must persist; we cannot do otherwise. O, that our faithful scriptural discussion might convince those, who think differently, so that the dissent with which the Marburg *consensus* closes might vanish through the "confirmation of a correct understanding, and we become altogether united as brethren in the sacred truth and in the communion of the glory of the Lord, John 17: 22 ss. which in the Holy Supper, transfigures itself for us who are upon this dark earth, mildly like moon-light in the night. This will take place, when we, denying ourselves, "earnestly invoke Almighty God for it in the name of our exaltedly glorified, and yet infinitely compassionate High-Priest, as the fathers have made it our duty so to do.

#### 6. *The positive determinations of the Reformed Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.*

It now only remains for us to examine the positive determinations of the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In doing this we pass by all individual modifications it has received from the commencement, in consequence of the varying interpretations given to the words of the institution, and simply confine ourselves to that statement of it which, according to the form in which it is presented, is to be regarded as the one most recognized, namely, to that of the Heidelberg Catechism, which justly commands among the Reformed Confessions, especially in Germany, the highest authority. It must, however, at the out-set, be acknowledged, that the Catechism labors to place in the back-ground that view of the sacrament, according to which it is regarded as a mere symbolical significatory representation of Christ's sacrifice, the better to keep alive the remembrance of it, or instead gives prominence to its exhibitiv and testamentary character. Already the first question on the Holy Supper (the 75th of the Catechism) bears upon the point, how the recipient is admonished and assured, that he partakes of that one sacrifice of Christ and of all its benefits. According to the answer it is done thus, that Christ has commanded me and all believers, to eat of this broken bread, and to drink of



this cup, in remembrance of him, adding these promises (*ad-  
ditis his promissis*) first, that his body was offered and broken  
on the cross for me, and his blood shed for me, as certainly  
as I see with my eyes the bread of the Lord broken for me,  
and the cup communicated to me : and further that he feeds  
and nourishes **my soul** to eternal life, with his crucified body  
and shed blood, as essentially (*non minus certo*) as I receive  
from the hands of the minister and taste (*percipio*) with my  
mouth the bread and cup of the Lord, as certain signs of the  
body and blood of Christ." The same is declared and con-  
firmed in the answer to the 79th question (Why then doth  
Christ call the bread his body, and the cup his blood, or the  
new covenant in his blood, &c?) "Christ speaks thus not  
without good reason, namely, not only thereby to teach us,  
that as bread and wine support this temporal life, so his cru-  
cified body and shed blood are the true meat and drink  
whereby our souls are fed to eternal life ; but more espe-  
cially by these visible signs and pledges to assure us, that  
we are no less truly partakers of his body and blood (by the  
operation of the Holy (Ghost) than we receive by the mouths  
of our bodies these holy symbols in remembrance of him ;  
and that all his sufferings and obedience are as certainly  
ours, as if we had in our own persons suffered and made sat-  
isfaction for our sins to God."

According to this view the celebration of the Supper is not  
simply a contemplation of the sacrifice upon the Cross, but  
at the same time an assurance, that it has been rendered for  
the communicant as certainly as he sees with his eyes the  
act also performed for him, and further, that his soul is as  
assuredly fed and nourished with the body and blood of  
Christ to eternal life, as the body with the bread and wine to  
bodily life. Now here are evidently assumed two acts, differ-  
ing according to their essence and with no internal connec-  
tion, but only externally united by a certain figurative re-  
semblance, of which the one actually and visibly taking  
place, only adds an effectual assurance, both to that which  
at first took place upon the cross, and also to that invisibly  
taking place in the Spirit. As certainly as the Christian  
receives with his mouth the bread and wine of the Supper, so  
truly has Christ died for him upon the cross, and so truly  
does his soul receive the body and blood of Christ, of which  
bread and wine are not the bodily channels, but only signifi-  
catory signs, or representative symbols, which derive their  
pledging and sealing character entirely from the synchoro-

nism of their presentation ~~and~~ reception. According to this the sacramental part rests only in the assurance of a fact by the addition of one still stronger, such as appears also in other forms, viz: as I live, or, as the Lord lives, or, as true as the sun shines in the firmament, or the clock strikes, or otherwise this or that happens to you or me, so true is, or happens also that. It is true a visible fact or perceptible sign may in this way also serve for a higher and greater gift; yet the less connection and communion such a pledge has with the object of its assurance, the more accidental and arbitrary, lifeless and uncertain is it, and the less does it insure. The crucifixion of the Lord and the celebration of the Holy Supper with bread and wine, but without the body and blood of Christ in them, have far too little affinity with each other, as that this should give to me a living attestation of the other, and just so are bread and wine a far too lifeless pledge by themselves, so as impressively to attest or warrant to the soul the feeding with the body and blood of Christ, especially as it cannot be conceived, how such a *bodily* feeding of the *soul* may be accomplished. Add to this, that the pledge is only to affect the body which is incapable of faith, and the gift at the same time, it is true, yet only incidentally; but the believing soul, on which it is to lay hold, immediately. Hence it would follow, that the accompanying *word* would also have to be so much more direct and binding. This, however, it is not, and here the principal defect comes to light, namely, that whatever might be said in favor of those paraphrastical answers, the word of the Lord, which is alone decisive, is against it; for he neither says, as certainly as I break this bread for you, so certainly have I been crucified for you; nor, as certainly as you with your mouth eat this bread, so certainly does your soul receive my body; nor yet only: take and believe, that your spirit may at the same time receive, through the Holy Ghost, my body or the spirit of my body. He rather says absolutely of the broken bread and the consecrated cup, take and eat, this is my body, and, take and drink, this is my blood, or the new covenant in my blood. Therefore, let men say, what they will, the Lord declares indubitably, that the higher food which he, in his Holy Supper gives, in connection with the meat and drink of the temporal meal to eat and to drink, is his body and blood. And by these words of his testament, which will stand firm, whatever else may totter and fall, we like our fathers must irremovably abide, and ever again come

back to them as the centre of all decision. For the question at issue hangs not on the multifarious *How*, of the bodily presence of the Lord, on the manner of its mediation through his or the Holy Spirit's ubiquity, or on its substantiality, essentiality or vitality, but rather on the precise *Where* of the presence, or its precise connection with the visible element, of which the Lord says, that it is his body and his blood. This is the basis of the sacrament, and how upon and in it Christ's Divine human, *pneumato-somatic* and mediatorial presence defines and communicates itself to us, this is the principal question. The other questions, whether and how Christ is also spiritually and bodily present to the souls of communicants in or out of the sacrament, and what communion the Holy Ghost keeps up between him and ourselves, are here comparatively only secondary and must not be drawn in to divert us from the *hoc*, and the *ταῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου*. We cannot, we dare not permit this, the point of the dogma concerning the Holy Supper, this the point of the Lord's word, this demonstrative epideictic *ταῦτο* which distinctly exhibits to us the bodily presence of the Lord in the bread and wine, to be turned for us in any other direction.\* Hence we must also, in opposition to the Heidelberg Catechism, persist in maintaining, that "the true body and blood of Christ are bodily in bread and wine;" or, as the Wittenberg Concordat of 1536, the first successful attempt at a union in the faith, expresses it, *sacramentali unione panem esse corpus Christi*, whilst according to the Catechism it is only *symbolum corporis*.

Yet our firm adherence to this centre of the words of institution, surrounded by many *radii*, is by no means the only argument, or the only objection which we oppose to the doctrine concerning the sacrament, as set forth by the Heidelberg Catechism, whose more valuable conclusion in regard to other articles of faith we cheerfully acknowledge. We allow that it gives prominence to the pledging character of the sacrament; but we cannot allow, that the pledge of the grace and communion of Christ, which he causes to be offered, is not the essence of Christ himself, which brings all his salvation along with it, but only a symbol without essence, which only assures us that, as certainly as the mouth par-

\*This is also done, if the presence of the *Where* and *There* of the substance is only transferred to the *Then* and *When* of the act.

takes of bread and wine, so certainly does the soul, if it believes, receive immediately through the Holy Ghost, something else, namely, the body and blood of Christ, from a great heavenly distance. It is indeed also a pledge of love, that our heavenly Father gives us our daily bread for the body, but what is this in comparison with his giving his only begotten Son to us in our flesh, with whom he gives us all things, righteousness, glory and the eternal indissoluble bond of love, Rom. 8: 32 ss. It is true, faith may also conclude from the gift of daily bread, that God will also give us heavenly bread; but how much greater, how much more precious and cordial is the pledge of love, if He is graciously pleased, to inclose the heavenly bread, which unites heaven and earth, in the visible temporal bread, to bless and sanctify by it our entire, not only our spiritual, but also our bodily life. We allow, that the Heidelberg Catechism seeks in the Holy Supper a union, not only with the spirit, but also with the body of Christ, consequently with the whole Christ; but we cannot allow, that it refuses its communication to the entire concrete man and confines it only to the abstract of the soul, attempting to put off the poor body only with the empty symbol, with a little bread and wine. The desire, that Christ's spirit and body, or his spiritual body (σώμα πνευματικόν) 1 Cor. 15: 44, should also benefit our spirit and life, is so natural, so logical and analogical, that already on this account the opposite opinion must be discarded. We cannot consent, that the Son of God, who has assumed, purified, renewed and glorified our flesh and blood, should now thus retain it, in exalted glory, only for himself, and impart nothing of it to his poor Church, his poor spouse on earth, (Eph. 5: 25 ss.) The Catechism feels indeed how cruel this would be, and therefore also assumes, with regard to the passage just cited and John 6, in the answer to the 76th question, on eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, which "is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and therefore to obtain the pardon and life eternal, but also, besides that, to become more and more united to his sacred body, by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us; so that we, although Christ is in heaven, and we on earth, are, notwithstanding, "flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone; and that we live and are governed forever by one Spirit, as members of the same body are by one soul."



This extract certainly exhibits an effort, worthy of esteem, not to let that be put asunder what God has joined together. But it is after all only a union *per distantiam*, and not *per substantiam*. Christ is in heaven, which is high and vast; but we are upon this low earth; that which unites us most wretched beings with him is, according to that representation, only the agreement or unity of the Spirit, who is both in Him and in us, and who therefore also continually assimilates our bodily essence nearer to his (if not *in homousia*, still yet *in homoiousia*), and then also unites us morally with him as members of the body of his Church, which is governed by the same Spirit. The opinion expressed by Calvin, that the Holy Ghost brings down to us, out of the glorified body of Christ in heaven, an emanation of life (*vigor vitalis*), like a ray from the sun, is not expressed in the Heidelberg Catechism; nor yet does it reject it. In so far, however, as these rays of light are directed not to the elements in the sacrament, but straightway to the life and essence of believers, who already possess the Holy Ghost or immediately receive him, nothing essential is gained for the sacrament, and the Mediator himself, the God-man remains still, according to his concrete essence, at a distance from us. The Holy Ghost ever appears almost exclusively as the redemptory person in the God-head, who is, as such, present both in heaven and on earth, who unites heaven and earth and who governs, in the Church, without the presence of the Mediator as high priest, who does not accompany him, as we believe according to John 14 : 3 ; 18 : 23 ; 28, et. al., but remains seated in heaven, at the right hand of God, from whence he sends alone his Spirit and messengers.\* Thus it is expressly declared in the answer to the 80th question, that "Christ who, according to his human nature, is only in heaven, at the right hand of God his Father, and will *there (ibi—at ubi est dextra Dei?)* be worshipped by us. Compare also question 47.

With this assertion of the Heidelberg Catechism, which I cannot record without a feeling of profound melancholy, the doctrine of the Reformed on the Holy Supper comes in severe conflict with the doctrine on the *person of Christ*, and I cannot, according to my theological and ecclesiastical knowledge and conscience, do otherwise, than declare myself in decided opposition to it. This entire work contains the con-

\* See Schneckenburger on the two fold state of Christ, §18, p. 119 ss.



firmation of this opposition. It has been written to the praise of the Divine glory, but not so much of the infinite glory on high, as rather of the glory on earth, in the condescension to us men and sinners. From the commencement its aim has been to direct attention to the manifestations of the magnitude of God in little things,\* upon this little earth, in man, whom he has created after his beloved image, and to show, how the Lord also, after pride had accomplished man's ruin, took compassion upon him in the humility of his grace, how he promised a restoration in the seed of Abraham, how wonderfully he conducted them out of Egypt, through the desert, into the promised land, how he had given them the law and the prophets and how he, under the veil of a higher corporality, manifested to them, in a variety of visions, his glory as holy as it was gracious, with the promise of a manifestation still more glorious and condescending. Our meditations then passed over to the fulfilment in the New Testament of this great promise, basing itself upon the central-word of all Divine manifestations, namely, the word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily, and of his fulness have all we received grace for grace, that all things, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven, might be reconciled by him to himself. The gracious rays of this Divine glory in the flesh have been disclosed, and everywhere has been exhibited the humility of its sublimity and the sublimity of its humility, the grandeur in its condescension, and the condescension in its grandeur, with especial reference to the glorification of Christ in the sacrament of his holy communion. Can it now be possible to admit, would it not be absolutely in conflict with the analogy of the Scriptures and of faith to admit, that this Divine glory in the flesh of the glorified human nature, is, after its work of suffering has been finished on earth, now idly resting on an immovable seat in heaven? What, this, the greatest and most perfect of God's acts of love in the created universe, his personal incarnation, this most holy act should now be suspended, and he should now be at a distance from and a stranger to us precisely with that in which God has approached nearest to us, in our own graciously assumed nature, in which he has become Jesus Immanuel, or be so immensely above us, that he can no longer let himself down to his poor relations on earth, that

Jesus with his pure humanity can no longer be near to that poor humanity, to whom the immediate presence of God is like a consuming fire?\*. He can be it according to his omnipotence; he will be it according to his mercy; he is it truly, essentially and communicatively in the sacrament of communion; the proofs are before us anew in this work, and I seek the man who will refute them. We have indeed such a high-priest, who sitteth at the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens, (Heb. 8: 1); but whose footstool is the earth, (Isai. 66: 1; Eph. 1: 22), and who is therefore also present on this footstool, before which all his enemies, being reconciled, shall fall down at his feet, and consequently be obliged to worship him, not only on the high throne of the majesty, but also here below, within the humble tabernacle of his Church before his footstool, Ps. 132: 7. No one dare deny, even of the petty majesty of an earthly king, that it is gracious, without an offence against it. He who then can conceive of the most exalted king, the high-priest of humanity upon the throne of eternal majesty, after having been so highly exalted from the depth of earthly suffering, without the most condescending grace and profoundest sympathy with our infirmities, according to which, he also has his mercy-seat still among us in his Church, upon which are placed the Manna of his holy communion and the cup of the new covenant in his blood, that we may come to it with boldness, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. Heb. 4: 16 s.; 10: 19 ss.† Who is like the Lord our God, who dwelleth on high, who humbleth himself, Ps. 113: 5 ss. High and glorious is the seat of the Son at the right hand of God the Father, and because this is so, it would be a shame were we forced to say, that this exalted hand of the Lord, which moves all things, was itself immovable, or that it was too short to reach down to the earth this victorious hand, Ps. 118: 16, which does indeed lift itself up high and closes itself firmly when it takes hold of the sword of judgment (Gen. 32: 40 s.) but which reaches far and opens itself wide, when it blesses and

\**Nuda divinitas nobis miseris peccatoribus est tanquam ignis consumens aridissimas stipulas.* Form. Concord. p. 786.

†*Non vult nos circa cardines coeli oberrare incertos in qua coeli plaga Christum in humana sua natura vel quarere debeamus, vel invenire possimus, sed in Coena ipse externa actione et visibilibus signis notat, ubi corpore et sanguine suo velit adesse.* Chemnitz, *Fundamenta* ss. Coena cap 11.

satisfies the desire of every living thing. (Ps. 141 : 7 : 145 : 16) with good will to men in Christ Jesus, who with his human divinity and his divine humanity is ever present to his Church as her mediator.\*

The objections, therefore, of restricted ideas in regard to the sitting at the right hand of God against the high-priestly presence of the Lord, *i. e.* against the mediatorial presence in his Church, according to both his natures, through the union of which he is our mediator, may be looked upon as silenced. (Compare *Colloquium Lipsiense* a. 1631. X. XII.) It cannot be admitted, that the God-man, the reconciler of the world should have retired to the throne of the majesty to rest, and have committed his high-priestly office on earth to the Holy Ghost, after that he had finished upon it, for all, the sacrifice, which now is to be communicated to them more and more widely, whilst he remains only in heaven, where there are no enemies to be reconciled. All his enemies do not yet lie prostrate at his feet as reconciled; death the last great enemy is not yet destroyed: hence does Jesus also govern in the kingdom of grace, in the Church militant, as mediator under the sign of the cross, and just because all things have not yet become subject to his grace, he has therefore also not yet committed this kingdom to the Father, and also appears himself not yet in the glorious form of the majesty, but continues to reveal his presence in

\*Examine in connection with this paragraph the Form. Concord. Art. VIII. de persona Christi, especially p. 783 and Chemnitz de duabus naturis in Christo, cap. 30, de presentia totius personæ Christi secundum utramque naturam in Ecclesia. We extract the following beautiful passage: Non in illo tantum loco ac in illo solum modo momento, ubi et quando coena dominica in publico Ecclesiæ conventu celebratur, Christus totus, utraque sua natura, Ecclesiæ in terris militanti adest, quasi mox peracta illa celebratione, præsentiam suam subducat, vel, sicut glossa in Decretis loquitur, in coelum avolet, ac membra Ecclesiæ extra publicum conventum in vocationibus suis, in tentationibus et tribulationibus, dulcissima illa præsentia Christi, Pontificis, Regis, Capitis, ac fratris sui, priventur; sed actio coenæ dominicæ est publica, solennis ac peculiaris testificatio et ob-signatio, quod Christus Mediator et Salvator noster velit Ecclesiæ suæ in his terris militanti elementer adesse, non dimidia, seu una tantum sui parte, sola scilicet sua divinitate, sed totus ac integer, hoc est illa etiam assumpta sua natura, qua nobis consubstantialis, cognatus et frater noster est, in qua tentatus est, ut possit nostris miseriis compati, in qua passione et morte sua opus redemptionis nostræ perfecit, ut ita nos membra efficiamur corporis ejus, de carne ejus et de ossibus ejus, Eph. 5. Also here too the proper mean between those who acknowledge only inclusive presence, be it above in the tabernacle of heaven or here below in the tabernacle of the altar.

The holy bodily veil of the sacrament of reconciliation. The Holy Ghost, who had spoken through the Prophets of the future Christ, and through the Apostles of the present Christ, is neither Christ himself nor yet his substitute; he is a different person from the Son; he is God, he is love, but not so much the love with which the Son loves, as rather that with which he is loved; he is the Spirit of truth, who testifies of him, through whom he becomes known, who reproves the world of sin, because they believe not in him, who produces faith and its fruits, and prepares the hearts of men for his reception and unites the Church about him in faith and love. Everywhere he points to him either as to come, or supposes him present, but does not put himself in his stead nor throws him in the back-ground. Christ the Mediator, the God-man is and remains the present, not merely transcendent, but also the immanent centre of the Church, around which the Holy Ghost draws his sacred circles concentrically, beginning at the Most Holy place and continuing them outwardly to the very courts beyond, though building for him out of living stones the temple of the Church, which is also Christ's body, but his other body, animated by a different personality from his own, and united with his in holy communion, Eph. 5: 25 ss. If the Divine Mediator, who unites Divinity and humanity, was not with the bread of his life and the cup of the covenant of his blood, in the midst of the Church, then the Church of fulfilment, the Church of the New Testament would stand behind the prophetic Church of the Old Testament with its cloud of glory above the ark of the covenant within the Holy of Holies. We, however, cannot on any account accord to it such a preference.

The Heidelberg Catechism contains, according to its popular-didactic and ironical character, no especial polemic against our doctrine of the mediatorial and essential presence of the whole Christ in his Church and sacrament. The principal arguments, which on the part of the Reformed are raised against it, and which have also been particularly urged by Calvin\* are these two, namely, first, that it is contrary to the reality of human nature and the corporality of Christ, because this would, in accordance with it, be expanded in infinity; and secondly, that it is unworthy of his heavenly majesty, because this would thereby be drawn

\**Institutio religionis Christianae* lib. IV. cap. 18. 219. 31. 32.



down into earthly elements. In reply to these objections we have to offer but few remarks. As regards the *first* argument, all that is necessary has already been said by us in the Christological discussions of the work, especially in our contemplation of the state of exaltation. Here is only yet to be added, that it cannot indeed belong to the reality of the human nature in Christ, to remove and separate it far as heaven from mankind on earth, for whom it was assumed, and to place its bodily presence confined within narrow limits in the boundless spirit-world of heaven, and only his spiritual presence here below on this material world. Then to guard against prejudices and promote a better understanding, we can show by authentic proof, that it is by no means our intention to maintain an absolute ubiquity or extensive infinity of Christ's human nature, but on the contrary, rather reject, in the most decided manner, with the Form. of Concord, (Art. 8, on the person of Christ, conclusion) 1. "That the human nature, on account of the personal union, is mixed up with the Divine or changed into the same; 2. That the human nature in Christ is everywhere present in the same manner as the Deity, as an infinite essence, through the essential power and attribute of its own nature; 3. Again, that the human nature in Christ has become equal to the divine nature in its substance and essence, or in its essential attributes; again, that the humanity of Christ is locally expanded into all places in heaven and on earth, a thing which is not to be attributed even to the Deity. *But that Christ by his Divine omnipotence can be present where he pleases with his body, which he has seated at the right hand of the majesty and power of God, especially where he has promised to be present, as in the Holy Supper, his omnipotence can effect this, indeed, without a transmutation or an abolition of his true human nature.* This latter sentence in italics is the thesis, the plainly defined thesis, and not complicated with difficult forms and inferences, on which we stand, and heartily pray, that it may become a synthesis, to agree with it and to trust to the Divine omnipotence and wisdom of Christ, *i. e.* his omnipotent personality, which is on all sides acknowledged as the point of union between the divine and human nature,\* that it can bring about what it

\*Calvin l. c. 230 also admits in a scholastic manner, that it may be maintained: Totus Christi (as a person) ubique est, but not, totum quod in eo est (also the human essence) ubique est. Neither is this affirmed in the human nature, in the same manner in which it is



has promised, without abolishing in the communion of the love of both natures the reality of either. Should any, however, still object by maintaining, that, in the event of the Holy Supper being celebrated simultaneously in different localities on the earth, a simultaneous presence in many far distant places would of necessity also have to be attributed to the corporality of Christ, let them well remember, in return that the whole petty earth, is to the Christ exalted above it only one space, one locality and that, moreover, relatively speaking, a very small locality, a little Bethlehem, and let them also not forget, that his Church on earth, though consisting of different members, is nevertheless only one body, the body of his communion, which he can therefore affect with the organic unity of his bodily presence in the twinkling of an eye (as quickly as the eye takes in with one look even the horizon), where, when and how his love pleases. If even impersonal, material substance, such as air, light and electricity possess a presence which distributes itself and permeates other objects on earth in great rapidity and extent, how can we refuse to the glorified and highly spiritualized body of Christ (1 Cor. 15: 46 ss.), which embraces all the substances of life in the highest potency and closest contact with omnipotence, to affect with his tender presence the body of his Church confided to him, whether its extent be narrow or wide on our diminutive globe, and spread over all his brood, even over such as have strayed away, his protecting wings. Surely from him in whom dwelleth the fulness of the living God-head bodily are continually issuing streams of life in all directions. Yet he does, according to our view, by no means waste away in consequence of this out-pouring into an indistinct, empty and shapeless generality, so as to be obliged to give up the form and features of the Son of man, and no longer manifest himself and visibly appear with them concretely recognizable, according to his promise, at the end of the world, on the

of the Divine. If, however, ubiquity is ascribed to the personality which is the determining centre and actuating will of both natures, it certainly also follows from this, that the personal present Christ is able to be present, where he pleases, through the energies of his personality, consequently with his human nature which is personally his own, and which cannot possibly be to him a too heavy and un-managable mass—and it is just this, which we maintain. Those who deny it, do not thereby exalt, but rather lower the state of exaltation.

day of the resurrection of the dead to judgment. We believe in the promise of this his visible and majestic presence at the end of the world, just as implicitly, as we believe in his invisible condescending presence, which he promises at the close of the gospel of Matthew: Behold I am with you always, even unto the end of the world, compare 18: 20. This is promised by Jesus, not the pure God, but the God-man, to his disciples, his Church immediately after he declared the full power that had been *given* (according to his Divinity he possessed it from all eternity) him in the words: All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, Matt. 28: 18, compare Col. 19: 3. Who on earth dare venture to call in question this power, or to doubt, that he is able to do even more with it, than the sceptic is able to comprehend?

As regards, finally, the second argument, namely, that our doctrine is unworthy of the heavenly majesty of Christ, because this would thereby be drawn down into earthly elements, we answer, that we recognize in such a depreciation of the earthly elements the unvanquished remains of that proud spiritualism, which already at the commencement of the Reformation caused, by its extravagant enthusiasm, at Wittenberg itself, the first schism in the great work, which would have torn it in pieces, if Luther, hastening from the Wartburg, had not with all the weight of courageous prudence and Christian wisdom, thrown himself into the breach and, preserving the true mean "between the spirit of the Pope, which seeks to make everything bodily, and the spirit of fanaticism, which seeks to make everything spiritual," had, by his powerful preaching and writings against Carlstadt, subdued this imperious spirit in such a way, that it was forced more and more to retreat from his extreme position. Notwithstanding, an inclination towards that spiritualism has not altogether been overcome within the domain of the Swiss Reformation, however much it endeavored to incline toward proper prudence, having succeeded in misleading, in the doctrine of the sacrament, even a theologian like Calvin to that, not Divine, but human view, as if it was beneath the dignity of the *supra omni mundi conditionem* exalted God-man to mix with any further with the earthly element. But if, after all an earthly element, namely, human nature, should still be undoubtedly present in the exalted God-man as such, must it not, according to that opinion have been altogether unworthy of the high Majesty of his Divinity, before his incar-

nation, to let himself down so low into the earthly element, as to become man, a poor child in a manger, a suffering, maltreated, yea, a crucified man? And yet he has become all this according to his great compassion. Is to believe in this his compassionate, humble incarnation also, "a drawing of him down from heaven unworthily?" On the contrary, it is just this which appears right worthy that, as Augustine says, the *major misericordia* has come down into the *magna miseria* (Heb. 2: 17), which Calvin, too, does not deny. Now if our poor flesh and blood was not too objectionable for his pure Divinity compassionately to assume it, why should bread and wine be too objectionable for his incarnate Divinity in order still to commune in it compassionately with our flesh and blood? Surely this, is not too insignificant for "the humility of his love for man," nor too lowly for him, who is no less lowly than exalted. All the manifestations of God are full of his condescension. "How does God humble himself," says Hamann, "when he becomes Creator! how does he humble himself when he becomes man! and how does he humble himself when he becomes writer." In the orthodox sense it is therefore already justly maintained, that even the creation, like all *opera Dei ad extra* are not without a denying of self, a condescension on the part of God. This work has presented the proof, how the biblical manifestations of the glory of God, have their special glory precisely in their being connected with such a profound and gracious condescension of God to his creation, to the earthly and human being in which the manifestation of his presence is embodied, and therefore also glorified. Hence it is from the beginning directed against the sublime abstractions, which sometimes border on and run into Manicheistical spiritualism, which is still ostentatiously displaying itself in modern philosophy. But the *sublimitas in humilitate* and the *humilitas in sublimitate Christi* is in particular referred to everywhere in its Christological part, and his exaltation in the state of his humiliation, not less than his condescension in the state of his exaltation exhibited in such a way, that the assertion which depends upon the "spirituality of his entire kingdom,"† namely, that it would be degrading to the heavenly majesty

\*Non ducimus fas esse, cum e coelo detrahere, Calvin l. c. §31.

†Ut spirituale est totum Christi regnum, ita quidquid agit cum ecclesia sua, ad rationem seculi hujus minime exigendum est. Calvin l. c. §32.

to unite his presence with the earthly elements of the sacrament, may well be regarded as confuted. It still stands fast: Jesus receiveth sinners and eateth with them, Gal. 15: 1 ss. If the angels in heaven experience a greater joy at this, than at many of the spirits made perfect above, who do not stand in need of repentance, then it is surely a greater proof of the gracious majesty of Jesus, to grant this joy to the heavenly spirits, than to receive without end their jubilations and songs of praise only in the glory of heaven,\* however beautiful this may be.

Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart (ταπεινός τῇ καρδίᾳ), says the Lord, in the same glorious discourse, Matt. 11: 29 ss. in which he had before just as majestically said concerning himself, *all things are delivered unto me of my Father*, as he has said mercifully, *Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest*. If we learn of him to be truly meek, we shall find rest for our souls and peace in our conflict, and learn to know the truth in the obedience of his Word and the communion of his Church. Not victory let us seek, but the truth in the humility of Christ. *Non est alia via*, says Augustine, in his letter to Dioscorus, epist. 118: 22, *ad capessendam et obtinendam veritatem, quam quæ munita est ab illo, qui gressuum nostrorum videt infirmitatem; ea est autem prima, humilitas; secunda, humilitas; tertia, humilitas*. This sentence has indeed long been familiar to us, but is still too little known in its profundity and still less followed, especially in our time, which has lost itself among so many proud heights, and still continues to delight in boasting, notwithstanding its unprofitableness. Thus modern theology boasted most of progress, when it was nearest to dissolution. Hence a humble return is still greatly to be recommended. It would, however, be altogether opposed to humility to recommend it only to others and not also to ourselves. Let the Papal Church bear itself ever so proudly, we will the more humble ourselves before our God, who regards the lowly, and he will exalt us. Laying aside, therefore, our mutual boasting about the excellencies, here of the Lutheran and there of the Reformed Church, let us rather strive to regard them as common property, or to make them such. The fact that we, on our part, have the purely developed doctrine, should cause us to blush so much the more, because we have

\*Compare Schneckenburger on the two-fold state of Christ, p. 154



especially in latter times been so remiss in faithfully preserving it, and in manifesting so little zeal and union in adorning it by a pure life, discipline and diligence in good works; and the many martyrs, who bled in England and France, did not die so much for the dissent, as for the confession of the common Gospel, as it is already mutually established in the Marburg *consensus*. In all countries of Evangelical Christendom there has, however, occurred recently, after the terrible events of the Catholics in the land of Revolution, beneath the cold light of the new moon of enlightenment, such an eclipse of divine truth, and such a great apostasy from it, in all directions, that all the churches, still under the displeasure of the Divine wrath, stand in need of nothing more, than to repent and cry for mercy for their great and manifold sins and infirmities. We Evangelical Christians will, united in love, mutually encourage one another to this in the words of the Prophet Hos. 6: 1: Come, and let us return unto the Lord; for he has torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up. Then will the glory of the Lord again shine upon us, the glory of the incarnate God, a glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth, and we shall be one in the brightness of this glory. John 17: 22.

## ARTICLE II.

UNIVERSITIES—TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF  
REV. AUGUSTUS THOLUCK, D.D.

By Rev. F. A. MUEHLERBERG, A. M., Professor in Pennsylvania College.

1. *Greek Universities.* The name *Universitas* does not mean originally, as was subsequently supposed, a *Universitas Literarum*—even the ancient name *Studium Generale* has not this signification—but it is rather the name of a *Corporation*, either *Magistrorum*, as generally at Paris, or *Scholarium*, as at Bologna. Universities had their origin in the times of the Emperors. The first one was that at Athens, under Hadrian and Antoninus,) supported by the State, a college of



sophists (Rhetoricians), philosophers and professors of political eloquence. At Rome also, Professors were appointed in the Athenacum (a rhetorical Odeum), after the time of Hadrian; under Severus, an Astrologer. The High-School at Constantinople was founded in the year 425, with 28 salaried teachers of the Greek and Roman Language and Literature, one for philosophy and two for the science of law. (*v.* Bernhardt *Outline of Grecian Literature*, 2 Ed. I. 545). There were also schools of law, in the times of the emperors, at Rome and Berytus. Accurate accounts have been published only of the Institute at Athens, from which it appears, there were similar regulations and customs, with reference to teachers and students, with those of subsequent periods, (Privileges, Fees, Lecturers' Chairs, Revenue of the Professors, Fraternities of students with Seniors, "Drubbing," "Pinching"). (*v.* Schlosser and Bercht *Archiv für Geschichte* I. 225, 233, in the Essay upon Greek Universities in the time of Julian and Theodosius. As to the ceremonies of deposition at Athens, *Schule* in the Weimar Jahrbuch 1857, p. 2.)

2. Universities of the Middle Ages. Just as in the times of the Emperors, individual rhetoricians and sophists opened their lecture rooms in localities to suit themselves, and gathered around them a number of scholars, so also in the middle ages, a William of Champeaux, an Abelard and others. Since the 12th century, however, the corporative spirit of the middle ages has been creating corporate Institutions also for scientific instruction. First for professional studies: 1150, the medical school at Salerno, about 1158, the legal one at Bologna, 1213, the theological one at Paris. Soon other Faculties were added to this for professional study: at Bologna; the Artists (*ars logica*), physicians, and in the second half of the 14th century theologians; at Paris: the Artists, the Decretists (Teachers of Canon Law), the Physicians. These faculties bore the name of colleges, subsequently *Faculties* from *facultas*, "a scientific department," hence the name for the teachers of it. (*v.* Savigny; *Roman Law in the Middle Ages* III. 232.) Whether or not a clerical character is to be ascribed to these schools of instruction, has been a controverted question until the most recent period. This can only be answered, as to the essentials, affirmatively. Just as all the instruction during the middle ages had its origin in the Church, and hence *scholares* and *clerici* were equivalent expressions, so also the University corpora-

frans seek and obtain their authority from the Popes, find in them their defenders, receive from them endowments, by means of prebends. In their regulations they borrow much from the ecclesiastical Institutions. The theological Faculty at Paris originates from the Cathedral school, the name *Rector* was borrowed from the clergy of the parochial church (*rector ecclesie*), the Faculties derived their regulations and the name of Dean from the cathedrals. The seal of the eminently Papal University, of Cologne, bore upon its obverse, the image of the Pope. The teachers of all the Faculties in Italy, France and Germany were, with few exceptions, obliged to celibacy. They, as well as the students, wore, as is still the case in England, a clerical dress. The exceptions to celibacy, which are found in Italy, Germany and France, occur only in the case of those teachers, who did not enjoy any spiritual benefices, and hence were not obliged to perform clerical duties. The full enjoyment of their privileges by Masters who had been married was questioned at Heidelberg. (*v. Tholuck Academic Life*, I. 12.)

At Paris, which was the chief school for Theology and philosophy, as Bologna for canon and civil law, there had arisen from the time of Abelard, in addition to the theological cathedral school, a great number of Artist-schools, which were obliged, from the second half of the 12th century, to obtain by petition the *licentia docendi* from the chancellor of Notre-Dame. By the Bulls of Innocent III of 1209 and 1213, these scholars received certain corporate rights, in consequence of which the powers of the Chancellor as regards the *licentia* were limited; from this period onwards, the University may be regarded as an independent corporation.

It was very natural, for those Masters who gave instruction and came from the same country, to be more closely attached to each other, and thus, since the middle of the century we find *four nationalities* existing, to whom others from their neighborhood, or of kindred race attached themselves; French, Normans, Picards and English. Whilst in the democratic organization at Bologna the *scholars* form these national Colleges, at Paris in consequence of its aristocratical constitution it is only the Masters. By degrees also the four Faculties obtained separate, corporate rights—the theologians the latest (1300), because they, since connected with the Cathedral schools, were under the immediate supervision of the bishop. The theologians, decretists and physicians.

constituted the three higher Faculties, the Artists the lowest, inasmuch as their instruction served only as a preparation for the special professional studies. Nationalities as well as Faculties formed smaller corporations, with their own seal, meetings, treasury, institutions for discipline. When more general interests were discussed, such as the privileges of the University, these smaller bodies were united in a general council. A rector, who was at first chosen quarterly, presided in general over the University, over the national corporations, a *procurator* elected monthly. The choice of the rector at Paris was determined only by the Artists, by delegates from the Masters of the Artists of the four nationalities: in Bologna two rectors were elected, one of the Jurists, and one of the Artists, by the scholars of the national corporations. Great were the privileges which the newly formed educational institutions received from the Pope and the kings: special courts, privileges (as clerical *corpora*) exemption of their property from seizure, etc. Rebuffus *de privilegiis Universitatum* mentions no less than 181 privileges of students.

One of the most important privileges of the University was the *conferring of Academical Degrees*, as an evidence of the attainment of the necessary qualifications for giving instruction. The first of which was the *Baccalaureate*, in the Testimonial written *baccalaureus*, (bachelor), i. e. the period of preparation for the Master's Degree, for Theologians at first a period of 3 years, since the commencement of the 14th century 14 years; then after the completion of an examination by the Chancellor of Notre-Dame the *Licentiate* i. e. the *licentia*, to teach and to preach publicly, even then connected with a compulsory feast; finally during the same year, the theological *Magisterium*.

The Instruction was by means of *Lectures* and just as generally by *Disputes*. After the future student had learned reading and writing in the elementary schools, he went—at Paris from 8--14 years—to the University, for the purpose of obtaining first of all in the Faculty of the Artists, his grammatical and logical training. The subject of these *lectiones ordinariæ* was Grammar according to Priscian, logic according to Aristotle and Boethius; Delivery: *expositio et questiones*. Besides the hours devoted to these *lectiones ordinariæ*, there were also *extraordinariæ* held, upon Metaphysics, Aristotelian Morals, Rhetoric, Astronomy and Languages. In Theology, in which, since the 14th century, the Masters limited themselves to preaching and presiding at

the Disputes, but committed the lecturing to the bachelors, the theme of their lectures was: first, the written text of the Old and New Testament with the aid of the glosses, tropically, analogically and allegorically explained, then the Sentences of Lombardus.

As regards the *students*, the Artists, who were very young in years, connected themselves with individual Masters, and became their scholastic dependents. Their poverty compelled them to perform humble services, such as copying books, cleansing clothes and shoes, frequently they became servants to a College, to some wealthy students, or Professors. Especially before the founding of the colleges, they were under very little restraint. Instances are mentioned of their public robberies, of breaking into houses, frequent fights, excesses in drink and debauchery: 1276, some were apprehended who were detected gaming upon the altars of the Churches. The spiritual judges to whom they were given over, exercised discipline with laxity, sometimes the civil *procurator* interfered, in violation of their privileges. In the 13th century, theological associations or colleges originated, and in the 15th similar ones for the Artists, so that at the close of this century, the greater part of the students were under the supervision and in constant intercourse with their teachers, and thus remained, to a considerable extent, free from the earlier excesses, although Gerson in his day complains bitterly in reference to the lax discipline, ignorance and immorality of the institutions. The Theological College, which soon surpassed all others in reputation, and has frequently been confounded with the theological Faculty of Paris itself, was that of the Sorbonne—a mistake which was occasioned by the fact that several members of the Faculty had taken up their abode in that college, the sessions of the Faculty, and the conferring of the degrees upon the Doctors usually took place here, and hence *Dr. en théologie* and *en Sorbonne* were used as identical.\*

The more recently founded German Universities have regulations similar to those of the University of Paris: Prague 1348, Vienna 1365, Heidelberg 1386, Cologne 1388, Erfurt 1393, Leipsic 1409, Rostock 1419, Greifswalde 1456, Freiburg 1457, Basel 1469, Ingolstadt 1472, Maintz and Tü-

\*Cf. The Article Sorbonne by Matter in Herzog's Encyclopaedia and as to the University of Paris in general Crevier, *histoire de l'université de Paris* 1761, 7th Part; Thuot de l'organisation et de l'enseignement dans l'université de Paris au moyen-âge, 1850.



bingen 1477, Wittenberg 1502, Frankfurt a. O. 1506. — With respect to the promotion of scientific culture in these new Institutions, it may be said that it consisted until the time of the Reformation, rather in the more general diffusion of the educational system which had prevailed at their origin than in its extension; more in the continuance of the course of study originally laid down, than in the establishment of new ones. Until the time of the Reformation, they remain, *in general* under the sway of the *stationary principle of Tradition*.

Paris especially constituted an exception. The University of Paris continued to be a lawgiver for the whole Christian world, so long as it was the highest theological authority of the Church, an authority, which, as already in 1387, in the contest of the University with the Dominicans, upon the *immaculate conception*, contended for the right of deciding theological questions, even against the Pope. Its most flourishing period was that, when the ornaments of the Catholic Church, a d'Ailly, a Gerson, a Clemanges, in succession, gave instruction in it. During this period, the Faculty of Paris appears as the defender of churchly freedom against the assumptions of the Pope, as patroness of a theology based upon the Scriptures and classical culture, in opposition to abstract scholasticism, and as the promoter of a life of practical piety in the Church. Even at a later period, she stands up successfully, on several occasions, on behalf of literary culture, and the liberty of the Church; in 1458 and subsequently, in opposition to the pretensions of the ignorant mendicant monks; 1554, she gives her celebrated decision against the order of Jesuits, and stands up in defence of the liberties of the Gallican Church, and to protest against the Bull *Unigenitus*. But she also arrays herself, as the German Universities, in opposition to authorized improvements. Humanitarianism, although it was able to obtain for itself enthusiastic adherents in all the Universities, was represented only by the younger men, generally those who had no regular appointment.

It is true, Paris had, since the time of Faber Stapulianus, (about the year 1514), Professors of the Greek, but the judgment, which the most recent investigator passes upon the Greek studies there, shows, how little the University was interested in the improvement of them: mais de 1500 a 1530, ou meme a 1540, c'est dans l'université moins que partout ailleurs, qu'il faut chercher une impulsion donnée



aux études grecques," (c. Rebitte', Guillaume Bude, 1846). It was also true of the German Universities, that the chief departments, Theology, Jurisprudence, Medicine, were occupied, with few exceptions, by adherents of Scholasticism, and retained for themselves, especially in Theology, the same method of instruction, which had been brought into use, at the first establishment of the University of Paris.

When even the Rhenish Electoral princes were desirous, in 1425, of imposing as a duty upon the Faculty of Artists of Cologne, a more simple and less scholastic method, they declined adopting this innovation (c. Hagen. *The Literary and Religious Relations of Germany*, I. 366. Bianco, *The University of Cologne*, I. 238). Heidelberg banishes in 1406, Jerome as a Realist innovator, (v. Häusser *History of the Palatinate*, I. 303). Prague contends against Wickliffe and Huss, (v. Palacky *History of Bohemia*, III. 196), Paris 1521 pronounces its condemnatory judgment upon the heretical doctrines of Luther and in 1545 censures severely the editions of the Bible by R. Stephanus, which drives him from Paris; in the neighborhood of Luther also, the entire Leipsic University, with scarcely any exceptions, raises itself in opposition to him, (c. Seidemann, *The Period of the Reformation in Saxony*, p. 25, 59), and with still greater vehemence, the papistical Frankfort. The chief combatant, in the contest for the papal interests, before all others was *Cologne*. The *Epist. Obscurorum Virorum* (1515-19) give contemporary pictures of the ruling party.

3. *The Protestant Universities since the Reformation.* (c. Tholuck *Academical Life of the 17th Century*, p. 1, 2.) By the influence of Humanism on the one side, and the return to the simple language of the Scriptures on the other, *Theological instruction* suffered, by means of the Reformation, an essential alteration; in all other respects, however, it may be said, that the old Institutions passed into the modern period, almost without change. Indeed, in general, there can scarcely be found a single other corporation, which knew how to present such a determined opposition to the influences of the changing spirit of the times, as the Universities. Oxford and Cambridge, and next to them, also the Swedish Universities, have maintained their mediæval character almost unchanged, and even the German ones still present, almost everywhere in their regulations, the unmistakable marks of their mediæval origin. Yet it can nevertheless be maintained, that since the Reformation, the Universities pre-

sent themselves to our consideration, under an essentially new aspect, which however first becomes evidently a matter of consciousness, since the 18th century, especially at the founding of the University of Göttingen: in the case of the original *churchly* institutions, the *State* at first becomes co-ordinate with the Church, until the latter finally becomes subordinate to the former. The authority necessary for the establishment of a University has become since the 16th century a reserved right of the Emperor. (v. Zöpfl, German Imperial History, p. 362.)

Until the end of the 17th century, the Protestant Universities, in all their Faculties, were also regarded as Institutions, designed to promote the interests of the Church. Just as the Statutes of Basel of 1459 impose it as a duty, upon the legal and medical Faculty, to make it their chief aim to promote the glory of God, so also we find in the *leges acad. Witteberg, 1595: Cum etiam PHILOSOPHICUS cotus pars esse debeat ecclesie Dei.* By many Jurists, the *corpora academica* are regarded as *ecclesiastica*, and even in 1682, Kniechen in his *opus politicum*, p. 1033, does not venture to give a decision decidedly against it, where the theologians constitute the majority. The immediate supervision of the affairs of the University, as well as the visitations of them, until the end of the 18th century, belong in Saxony to the province of the Superior Consistory, in Sweden to the bishop, in the Netherlands a spiritual *curator* was associated with the secular one of the Universities. Disputes were held in the *churches*, down to the time of Thomasius; conferring of Degrees in all the Faculties, until the present century. The members of the chapter at Tübingen laid aside "the black cowl" first in 1760, and even in 1801 black gowns and spiritual bands were deemed important. In Saxony, until the close of the 17th century, the *promocendi* in all the Faculties, especially also the so-called Masters of Exercises, as the teachers of fencing and dancing, were obliged to subscribe the Book of Concord. About 1720, when the religious oath was only irregularly administered in Electoral Saxony, greater strictness was observed, and it was re-imposed upon all *public* teachers. Nay even during this century, the renewal of it was desired by the clergy in 1811, and it was limited to the *theological* Faculty, only after the presentation of a Protest in 1812. (v. Weber, Saxon Ecclesiastical Law, I. 216)

The Head of the University even among Protestants is the *Rector*, enjoying princely honors, and holding a sceptre as the *insigne* of his judicial power: until the present time, he retains the title which was applied to him, since the end of the 15th century, "Magnificence," and even in 1715, Mencke obtained an order for the Leipsic Home Guard to present arms to the Rector. Next to him in Protestant Universities, as also at Paris, was the *Chancellor*, to whom belonged, if not the supervision of the studies, at least that of the degrees. In Prussia, as also now in Sweden, the bishop has this honor; until the period of the Helvetic Republic, it was the *Catholic* bishop in Basel, who conferred the degrees upon the Protestant Professors. As in ancient times at Paris, the choice of *Rector* was made at Leipsic even in 1830, by the Masters of the four Nationalities, and even in this century *Pontifical Laureati* were crowned, at this place, as Counts *Palatine*. The ancient relative rank of the Faculties, according to which the Artists (in modern terms the philosophers) took the lowest position, continues until the present time.

The *Privileges of the Academical Bodies* were also transferred from the ancient to the modern Institutions. The *civil* jurisdiction, extending to all the members of the University, which, after the example of Paris, all the Universities possessed, continues yet in Rostock; the *criminal* was retained, until the close of the 17th century, in Königsberg, Greifswald, Altdorf, Leipsic, Heidelberg; Halle retained it with certain restrictions in 1694; Göttingen 1731. Altdorf retained also jurisdiction in matrimonial affairs until 1756. In those Universities, as Tübingen, Marburg, Leipsic, Wittenberg, Jena, Frankfort, which retained the prelatical dignity, the Professors were members of the provincial legislature, and sat with the prelates, before the Lords. Until the commencement of the present century, the officers of the University possessed the privilege of exemption from taxes, quartering of soldiers, etc.; in the case of the newly established Universities, Halle, Göttingen, we find a commutation for this, by an excise, also certain privileges in industrial pursuits, as for instance the right of manufacturing and selling beer. In the election of the officers, the right of nomination belongs to the Senate, especially to the Faculties, which, though it has suffered many encroachments since the 16th century, it still retains, and it has also the administration of the funds.

The *Conferring of Academical Degrees* was regarded, even in the succeeding centuries, as one of the most distinguished privileges of the University, and it was only in the 18th century, that it began gradually to lose its importance. The entire scholastic course for theologians was from the philosophical Baccalaureate, through the Licentiate to a philosophical Mastership; and likewise in the same way from a theological Baccalaureate through the Licentiate to a Doctor of Theology. Still it was not accurately confined by all and everywhere to these degrees. The philosophical Licentiate ceased in Saxony in 1642, and the Bachelor's degree was closely connected with the Master's. In other places, the theological and philosophical Baccalaureate had declined, yet there were many such Bachelors in Leipsic in the 17th century, as for example the theologians Kunad, Anton, who, during particular periods, ascended all the rounds of the ladder. The theological Doctorate stood, until the close of the 18th century in the highest honor. In the seventeenth century, he had the title of "Excellency." Melancthon, in a discourse of 1533, speaks decidedly against conferring it too frequently; and Calixtus mentions, that it was conferred in Königsberg, only three times, since the founding of the University. That it was so seldom *desired* was owing to the great expense of 100 German dollars as a fee, and another 100 for the *prandium*, for which frequently the princes were obliged to be responsible; and also to the circumstance, that it could not be conferred, until the 18th century, *honoris causa in absentia*, but only after an *examen maxime rigorosum*. An accurate account, of the forms and the requirements, is given in a letter from Meyfert to Kessler in 1624. "Upon the arrival of the Candidate at Jena, he waits upon the Dean, who requests him to appear before the College, for the purpose of explaining to them the reason of his coming. This takes place in the house of the Dean, when the applicant delivers an *orationcula*. In case of a favorable answer, the Candidate Book is handed to him to inscribe his name, for which he pays a Rhenish ducat, for the Programme the same and a dollar. Hereupon follows the *tentamen*, for which 22½ dollars are paid. In this *tentamen* Hebrew is taken up, a *locus* of the Scriptures, then the *locus de persona Christi*, and the Division of the Books of the Bible. They then converse about the trial Lecture, and the Subject assigned is noted. The public Lecture, Dispute and Sermon follow. After the close of these, a gilt cup is handed to the



President; mine cost 10 dollars. The *famulus communis* receives for each ringing of the bell  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a dollar; I finished my Theme in four lectures; after the Dispute follows the banquet for the Licentiate, which costs 12 dollars. Finally succeeds the *rigorosum*, in which the *loci theologici* are passed through, so that each Professor conducts a particular controversy; then one or more difficult passages of Scripture are proposed to him for explanation: afterwards Church History follows, during which I was examined upon the Councils; then Ecclesiastical Law, *casus matrimoniales*, *casus conscientie*. Hereupon a *concie extempore* was desired, for the preparation of which a quarter of an hour's time was granted. In this examination 22 $\frac{1}{2}$  dollars were paid to the College, the *Promotor* received a rosenoble, the other Professors two Rhenish ducats." The ceremony of conferring degrees was attended, even until the end of the previous century, with all conceivable splendor; princes and princely disputes and magistrates as visitors, ringing of bells, waxen lights, etc.

The *personal qualifications of the Teachers*, in the 16th and 17th century were far superior to those of the present Professors. Teaching was regarded, for those who were advanced in the studies, as a further means of instruction and culture, and hence all philosophical Masters and theological Bachelors became private Tutors, particularly by lectures and disputes. In the time of its greatest prosperity, therefore, the University of Paris numbered more than 200 *Magistri regentes* i. e. *legentes*. The same arrangement continued in force until the last century, the *Magistri phil.* were authorized to hold even *theological* lectures, by the consent of the Senate, and after a special preparation *pro loco*: the privilege of reading was granted even to the better students, in Italian and French Universities, in the 15th century, by permission of the *Rector*. Even so late as 1736, we find the following in the Charter of the University of Göttingen: "It shall be allowed to all *Doctoribus*, *Licentiatibus*, *Magistris* and *Baccalaureis*, even though they be not Professors, to give private instruction in their profession." The *alumni* or *adscripticii* form the intermediate grade between the Masters and the Professors, to whom however the same privileges were not given everywhere and in all Faculties, yet, e. g. at Wittenberg (1587), they were also admitted *ad docendum* and *ad examinandum magistrandorum*. The distinction between *Prof. ordinarii* and *extraordinarii*, goes



back to the commencement of the Protestant Universities, and is found then already at Bologna (c. Savigny, III. 241); at Paris, it had its origin in the *lectiones ordinariæ* and *extraordinariæ* in the case of the Artists; and for the theologians, the *Baccalarii biblici et cursores*, i. e. those who taught at a regular hour, and the biblical books in succession, and those who read at hours to suit themselves and upon such books of the Bible as they selected.

The *Pag* of the Academical teachers in Germany was derived, as was also the case at Paris, partly from the prebends appropriated to the Pope and the bishops, or from endowments by the nobles; after the Reformation, principally from the sequestered possessions of the cloisters, donated real estate, or from the public treasury. The perquisites from the lectures, until the middle of the 17th century, were very small, as in the *public* lectures, to which the Professors were obligated by their pay, the whole prescribed course of studies was taught gratuitously; for the *privata*, which of course, were paid for by the students, the fixed *pensa* were trifling. Towards the end of the century, the subjects of the *privata* were not so strictly separated from those of the *publica*, on which account, the income from them was increased, but yet, as we learn from the frequent complaints of the period, it was paid very irregularly. At the commencement of the Protestant Universities, the fees especially of the physicians and artists were incredibly small. The theological Professor in Rostock received a salary of 80 florins, the legal 100, the *Magister in Artibus* only 40, the Professor of Medicine 30. During the year 1620, however, the salary of the Wittenberg theologians was not inconsiderable for that time. When the President of the Provincial Court of Justice of Mecklenburg received 2000 florins (capp. *Tarnow*), the prime minister of Württemberg only 300, (Pfaff: History of Württemberg III, 337), the salary of the highest Professor at Wittenberg, amounted to 500 florins, besides presents, in Strasburg 1500, that of Calixtus to 500 dollars. Yet the salaries do not increase proportionately with the time. On the contrary, many of the auxiliary sources of income, enjoyed in earlier times have ceased to be profitable: the large fees for the dedication of books to princes, the perquisites for disputes and degrees, the payments for testimonials, the revenue from boarders; and less frequently do we find small parishes connected with Professorships.

The instruction was given, as in the middle ages, by means of Lectures and Disputes, yet in the course of time, the number and estimation of the latter decreased. In the second half of the century, we find the charge more frequently made, that the Professors, for the sake of pecuniary advantage give less attention to the *publicis* than to the *privatis*, and students ridiculing those who attend punctually upon the former. The Disputes were also divided into *publicæ*, which the Professors were obliged to hold several times a year gratuitously and *privatæ*, which had fees connected with them, and here also we find persons complaining, that they could learn little from the former. The dictation of the Lectures, as it had become customary at Bologna and Paris, may seem to be justified, before the invention of printing, and it was so prevalent at Paris, that when a statute of 1333 bound the teachers by oath to do away with it, it could not be carried into effect, and they were obliged to repeal it in the 15th century (v. Thurot p. 26). But even after the invention of that art, they were suffered to disregard it, so that even after the Reformation, the dictation of the Lectures remained the *rule*, and if many exceptions occur in the 17th century, they are less frequent in the succeeding one: in some Universities indeed, old students maintained themselves, by revising and correcting the transcribed Lectures. Besides the customary repetitions of the Lectures at Paris, called *resumptiones*, were transferred to Germany, though it is true rather in the earlier period, and not universally; yet when Veltheim, at Jena in 1681, was requested to give his views in reference to the suppression of this practice, he is said to have replied: "*The boys do not wish more.*" The exclusive language of the Lectures is the Latin, and it is known, what a commotion the first German lecture of Thomasius at Leipsic occasioned; yet the theologians of Halle, Francke, Freylinghuysen, Anton, Rambach, soon followed him. Göttingen especially represents, in the present century, the modern era, Leipsic the ancient one. In the year 1650, 109 Protestant theological writings appeared in the Latin language, 131 in the German: in the year 1750, 47 in the Latin, and 298 in the German language. In the middle ages, the disputes constituted a counterpoise to the lectures, which were upheld by traditional authority, and the former awakened an independence of thought, which frequently carried individuals beyond the limits prescribed by long custom. But as, on the other side, a fondness for hair-splitting subtilty followed

in their train, the Humanists opposed the undue multiplication of disputes. "They dispute," writes Vives in 1531, "before, during and after meals; publicly, privately, in all places, and at every hour." Notwithstanding this, they were always highly regarded. The ecclesiastical Regulations of Augustus (1580) express the opinion, that more is to be learned from one Dispute, than from 20 Lectures. Thus in Saxony 12 Disputes were held yearly, by the four Professors, by the *Magistris Artium* every Saturday, by the Bachelors occasionally on Sundays, likewise by the stipendiaries in the Colleges, and on the many occasions, when degrees are conferred. One advantage resulting from these Disputes is undoubtedly the far greater logical readiness and precision, in definitions and distinctions, which the theological writings of that period display, when compared with those of the present; yet we must not fail to place, in the opposite scale, the marked disadvantage, viz, the fostering of a spirit of theological controversy, which treats the truths of religion merely as means of cultivating the understanding, and beside this, an inclination for sophistry and rhetorical artifices. Towards the close of the century, the judgment in reference to the value of them is changed. In opposition to the ecclesiastical regulations already referred to, the Professors at Jena assert, that many *studiosi* were interested only in disputes, "for whom it would have been better to have given more attention to the *collegiis lecturis*," and at the close of the century, we hear the complaint from Helmstädt and Tübingen, that the students themselves had become tired of disputing, and were not concerned to find opponents. During the 18th century, since the German language has banished the Latin, disputes are placed more in the back-ground, and at the close of the present century, they become a mere ornament, without any significance.

After the Reformation, an important change took place in the *mode of life* of the students. Even before this time, a dislike had sprung up to collegiate life under the Masters, and this system became more limited, and residence in town more customary. In the *Epp. Obs. Vir.* II. 80, we find: *ergo magistri habent ita paucos domicellos* (i. e. room-mates) *quod est scandalum \* \* \* nunc currunt hinc inde et non curant aliquid magistros et volunt omnes stare in civitate et comedere extra collegium.* After permission had been given to the *magistris* to marry, so many of them resided in the city, that the Leipzig Colleges, as von Osse

complains, stood deserted, and parents were at a loss to know how to educate their children. At Rostock, Wittenberg, already in 1500, permission was given to students, by the Rector or Dean, to live in the town, provided they had *magistri* to superintend their studies. The Statutes of Jena of 1569, limit however this rule of *Privati Præceptores* solely to the wealthy, whilst it was only required of the poorer ones, to have their recitations assigned them by the Professors. Only a few of the *Magistri* were able to furnish boarding, and thus the custom originated among the wealthy of finding out among the Professors, for themselves, those who could both board, provide for and advise them, and hence the majority of Professors, in the 17th century, were in the habit of having from ten to twenty students at their table. Those who were not able to pay the expenses of their board, which already in 1630 had risen to 70 dollars, received their support in the theological associations, just as many still maintain themselves, at Marburg and Tübingen, the revenues of which are under the supervision and control of the cloisters. A great portion of the students were also left to themselves, and with the commencement of the 18th century, the boarders with the Professors disappear. How much was lost at the Universities for the students, in the way of conduct and scientific advancement, by doing away with this social intercourse and the direction of their studies by younger students, may be seen by the favorable results, presented in both these aspects, at the Charitable School at Tübingen.

It appears, that—perhaps only with the exception of *collegiate* or *student life*—the German Protestant Universities, during their existence of three and a half centuries, have not suffered such radical changes, that the traces of their mediæval origin may not be distinctly recognized. The *point of view*, however, which they present to us, since the 18th century has become, as before remarked, wholly different. They are no longer regarded as Institutions of the Church, but of the State. This new feature has not remained without practical consequences; for their corporate rights, in consequence of the centralizing influence of the State, have been greatly diminished: at Göttingen, which was organized in 1736, in accordance with modern principles, the government claims for itself the nomination of the Professors, the theological Faculty has been made subordinate to the legal and classical, yet it has been made a principle, in theory at



least, if not in practice, that the instruction must be subject to no arbitrary restraints. Yet they were very far, from carrying this principle, consistently, into complete effect. Not only has the *Protestant* character of the most Universities been maintained, until the most recent period; but even the *Confessional* continued until the middle of the 18th century. In the Reformed Universities of Marburg, Duisburg, Hamm, only Reformed Professors are appointed in all the Faculties, and when in Göttingen the Lutheran theologian, Heumann, gave official information to the Government of his conversion to the Reformed doctrine of the Sacrament, it is true, through fear of being charged with intolerance, they did not depose him, yet they used means to silence him. The Superior Consistory in Saxony, still continues to be the highest Board of Education; in Prussia, the Department of Education is placed under the control of the Minister of worship, and where Theological Professors, or the Superior Church-council are appointed, he participates in the selection. A consistent application of the new principle in practice, has not yet taken place. What position, under such circumstances, the Church would assume, with reference to the University, *Erdmann* discusses in his Essay: "The University and its Position with reference to the Church," in his Miscellaneous Essays, 1846.

The Plans which have been proposed, either to a greater or less extent, for their re-organization, during the course of this century, have not been successful. \* \* \*

4. *The Theological Spirit and Influence of the different Lutheran Faculties.* The Lutheran Universities which had their origin, during the last three and a half centuries are the following: Wittenberg, Erfurt 1525, Rostock 1531, Tübingen 1535, Leipzig 1539, Greifswald 1545, Königsberg 1544, Jena 1558, Helmstädt 1576, Altdorf 1578, Giessen 1607, Rinteln 1621, Strasburg 1621, Kiel 1665, Halle 1694, Göttingen 1737, Erlangen 1743, Berlin 1810, Bonn 1817. The German Reformed Universities are: Heidelberg 1559, Frankfort 1591, Marburg 1607, Duisburg 1656; besides these, many High-schools or *Gymnasia Illustria*, as Herborn, Neustadt on the Hardt, Hamm, etc. It is true, we find differences in the development of the two Confessions, yet they are not of such magnitude as to require a separate consideration.

*The 16th Century.* The Humanistic, in conjunction with the practical and biblical spirit of the Reformation effected a



change in the theological instruction, both as regards its character and subjects.

As in earlier times, so also even up to the present, the philosophical course is regarded as the preparatory foundation for theological studies. In the Protestant Universities, however, the philosophical course of study was essentially improved and extended. *Improved*, inasmuch as the writings of Aristotle were read in the original, and when this was not the case, in the purer Latin translations of Argyropulus and others; and also the text books of Melanchthon. *Extended*, since Arithmetic, Geometry, Music, Astronomy, History, Geography and Poetry were either introduced for the first time, or more generally cultivated; the Greek Language was also studied through the Greek Grammar of Melanchthon, and the Hebrew according to that of Münster. The shortest period required for theological study was the Quinquennium, of which then two years, in fact, however, three to five were devoted to these preparatory studies, and in these schools, the young student, often undecided as to his profession, roamed about according to his own pleasure.

Among the departments of theological study, the dogmatic and practical explanation of the Scriptures, in the original languages, became, in the outset, so prominent, as the chief object, that the four theological Professors, according to the Strasburg Statutes, were appointed only for Exegesis: the *loci communes*, which had taken the place of the Sentences of Lombardus, could only be read, according to the Church Rules of Augustus, in connection with exegesis; at Tübingen, since 1601, it was thought necessary to have an Extraordinary Professor. We may say, that this practical, biblical spirit continues a peculiarity of Lutheran Theology, even to the end of the first century. By means of those educated at Wittenberg, but especially the pupils of Melanchthon, it was transferred to other Universities; we may regard as its representatives, a Heerbrand at Tübingen, Selnecker at Leipsic, Chytrius at Rostock, whose participation in the Book of Concord, should not however induce us to make them the friends of a scholastic theology, even though altogether since that time, the theology of the Church has taken, in a super-eminent degree, the direction of purity of doctrine. Still further also, it was the same Melanchthonian spirit, of course in co-operation with Calvinistic elements, which settled the Pala-

tine, Hessian and Alsacian Confessions. In Heidelberg and Marburg, to which many of the crypto-Calvinists, who had been banished from Wittenberg, had betaken themselves, Calvinism obtained the upper hand, and found in David Papius and other, eloquent defenders, whilst at the Strasburg *Gymnasium Academicum*, through the agency of Pappus and Marbach, the Lutheran Confession triumphed over the Calvinistic. Among the Lutheran Universities, *Helmstädt* was a chief seat of the Melancthonian *Humanism*.

Even after the removal of the two great Reformers, Wittenberg still maintained, except during the brief interruption occasioned by crypto-Calvinism, before all others, the highest rank. It continued to be the outpost, from which most of the German Churches, in their contests, awaited the decisive answer, and even at the close of the century had the influential dogmatic authorities, Egidius Hunnius and Hutter. In the second half of the 16th century, the average number of students, according to the matriculation book, was 3000, of whom by far the greater part were theologians. The cardinal question of theology at this period was, the relation to the Formula of Concord. After Wittenberg, Tübingen especially defended its theology, by means of the distinguished theologians, John Jac. Andreae, Heerbrand, Stephan Gerlach, Ilafenreffer. Helmstädt from the commencement pursued a singular course, in consequence of the special attention given there, to humanistic culture and the study of Aristotle, under Caselius and Cornelius Martini. The average number of students, at the two Universities last named, during this period, amounted to 4-500.

The number of Reformed Universities had increased during the first half of the 17th century. When the Christological contest between Giessen and Tübingen was settled, there was no other controversy of importance. The theology of the Formula of Concord becomes gradually complete, and without thrusting practical interests in the back-ground. But it is Wittenberg especially, which had such theologians as Francis Meissner, James Martini; and Rostock, which had Paul and John Tarnov, Quistorp I., Lütkeemann, in whom a life of faith and a pure confession were harmoniously united. With Wittenberg may be classed the most important schools of pure Lutheran doctrine, as Leipsic, with the celebrated theologians Höpfner and Hulsemann; Jena, with John Gerhard, the theological Oracle of Germany; Tübingen, with Luke Osiander II., Thummus and Melch. Ni-

colan; Giessen with its Winckelmann and Mentzer; Strasburg, with Dorsche and John Schmid. Helmstädt, which was looked upon with suspicion, falls behind these in the number of its students, for they vary between 180 and 400. Yet its influence, especially upon the statesmen of the time, was very salutary, and the Calixtine theology prepares the way for a subsequent more liberal belief.

In the second half of the century, that uniformity of instruction, which had been maintained through the half of it, was brought to a speedy dissolution. The interest which had been awakened for practical subjects, by the Calixtine theology, and which was a counterpoise to the onward progress of doctrine, gains in intensity by the Pietism of Spener, and in opposition to increased restraint on the orthodox side, at the close of the century, calls forth a transformation of theology. Even in this period, Wittenberg, through the unbounded influence of Calovius, still stands at the head of orthodox Conservatism, although it immediately afterwards suffered a great loss of students, by the Brandenburg interdict in 1662; yet even after the death of Calovius, his pupils and colleagues, Quenstedt, Deutschmann, Caspar Lüscher and others, formed an impenetrable phalanx. In this contest, so long as Mühlmann was on the stage, Leipsic took the side of Wittenberg; so also Giessen, whilst Haberkorn was at the head of its Faculty, especially however Strasburg, under Dannhauer; in the last decades, Strasburg is the only one left, which, after the loss of its political independence, and though oppressed by the Catholic Church, maintained unimpaired the strict spirit of orthodoxy, exhibited by Dannhauer.

On the other hand, the Calixtine theology obtained the mastery, about the middle of the century, in Altdorf and Königsberg; found some adherents in Rinteln and Kiel; and through Musäus, in consequence of an increased interest in practical subjects, gave a modified direction to theology at Jena. The practical turn given to theology at Rostock, even before the appearance of Spener, by its earlier distinguished theologians, becomes united, through the agency of Quistorp II., Grossgebauer, H. Müller, with the spiritual movement originated by Spener. Towards the close of the century, theologians influenced by Spener, make their appearance in different Universities; at Kiel, Kortholt; at Jena, Baier; at Tübingen, Raith the friend and instructor of Spener, and a little later Reuchlin and Hochstetter. At Giessen, where

even before the founding of Halle, under the fostering government of Elizabeth Dorothea, the daughter of Ernest the Pious, and she herself a genuine believer in the gospel, the Pietism of Spener finds a nursery. May is first appointed, then Bielefeld and Ernest Gerhard III., and in the course of a short time Gottfried Arnold labors as Professor of History, and Hedinger as Professor of Natural Law. The greatest renown, during this period, was enjoyed by Wittenberg, whose students still amounted to 1200; Leipsic which numbers 3-4000, the greater part of whom however belong to the legal Faculty; and Jena, where during the time of Musäus and until the close of the century, the number rises to 2500, the smaller half, jurists and physicians; many attracted thither less by a love of science than by the renowned hilarity of Jena. Veltheim and Danz, had according to their official documents, audiences of from 2 to 3 hundred hearers.

Until the 40th year of the 18th century, Orthodoxy and Pietism are still the questions, which divide the Faculties. From the time when *Halle*, more in consequence of the fame of its benevolent Institutions, than for its defence of theological questions, drew the eyes of all Germany to itself, it became the chief of the theological Faculties, and connected with all the movements of the age, and it retained this position, until the first decades of the 19th century.

From the commencement of the 18th century until 1740, the yearly average number of matriculants was 650, therefore about 2000 students, the majority of whom, however, during the first 20 years, belonged to the legal Faculty. The most celebrated Professors in the Faculty, were John D. Michaelis, Breithaupt, and after his death since 1727, John Jac. Rambach; the latter gives in a letter to Weissman at Tübingen the number of his auditors at 400; Joachim Lange, sustains the reputation of the Faculty abroad, as the ever-ready combatant, though not the individual of the greatest distinction. The remaining Professors were devoted almost exclusively to their practical labors. From Halle, Pietism was propagated in its genuine character, to Königsberg, where it obtains in Lysius, Lilienthal and Rogall, competent and zealous adherents; Giessen to which Halle gave up her Rambach in 1734, who, however, in the letter already quoted, gives the number of students as only 300, and his auditors at most 40; especially Jena, where Boddens its celebrated and influential representative, in consequence of his reputation.



was the means of increasing the number of matriculants to 700, and 4 or 500 hearers attended his lectures.

The ancient splendor of Wittenberg becomes dim before the rising sun of Halle and Jena, though even until the middle of the century, it strives to keep aloft "the standard of pure doctrine," around which however, with the single exception of Wernsdorf, no distinguished combatants are congregated. Leipsic, under Carpzov II., only however at the beginning, stood by the side of Wittenberg, as aid in the contest with Spener; Rostock, since Feiht (1690), in that with Halle; Greifswalde from the time of Fr. Meyer. The motive-power of Orthodoxy was dead; and after the 40th year of the century that of Pietism also.

It was Halle again, whence a new phase of theological agitation proceeded, *Wolfianism, Illumination*. Even at the founding of Halle, the embodied principle of illumination had been introduced by Thomasius, yet it had not been extended, beyond the jurists, to the University itself. The theological Faculty was first affected by it, through the philosophy of Wolf. Wolf had commenced his philosophical lectures in 1709, and in 1734, his pupil S. J. Baumgarten, through the influence of his Berlin friends with the King, was nominated as a member of the theological Faculty. The articles of belief did not suffer indeed any essential alteration, it was only a change in the mode of instruction, yet in such a way, that it had a marked influence upon the views concerning the nature of faith, and the method of confirming it. This was to be confirmed, not by the divine word, nor by the testimony of the Holy Ghost, but by clearness of definition and the evidence of logical demonstration. After the time of Baumgarten, whose lecture-room seldom contained less than 400 students fond of scribbling—his lectures consisted only in the most painful dictation—the matter was regarded in this light, that their sway was at an end, and the sceptre had departed to another school. In a letter to Weissman in 1740, Joachim Lange thus writes: "After the favored period of Spener, another succeeded, that of Wolf and Reinbeck, which ruined the Church and our University" and in 1742, *totus status noster pristinus, a quam egregius! penitus est mutatus*. This new, dry Scholasticism was not adapted to gain any abiding influence over the mind, yet however it introduced a cold criticism in place of the practical, religious earnestness of Pietism. The unphilosophical, sanguineous spirit of Seidler had also passed through this



school. As the pioneer of critical Rationalism, he labored in Halle from 1751 to 1791. Through his agency, an interest for historico-critical studies was awakened, upon the basis of a traditional though enervated piety, and in this respect, Halle surpasses in a marked degree the remaining German Faculties. In the flourishing period of Semler, from 1770-1780, the Faculty numbered 600-700 theologians, the number of whom in the following decade rose to 800.

Before the Pietistic Orthodoxy at Halle was compelled to give way to Illumination; Pietism had begun to assimilate itself to the former also, in the theologian Matthias Pfaff at Tübingen. However much the reputation of Tübingen was increased abroad, and also the numbers of the students, by the distinguished talent of this theologian, still a body of orthodox theologians continued to sustain themselves here until the middle of the second half of the century, Sartorius, Uhland, Hegelmaier, Märklin, Cotta. The Institution founded at Göttingen in 1734, exerted the most considerable influence upon the theology of the last decades of the century. A peaceable and tolerant disposition, were the first qualifications, which the political wisdom of the Minister von Münchhausen looked for, when giving a call to his theologians, and thus we find there a class of moderate and prudent orthodox men, who represent, until the close of the century, a Supernaturalism, which knew how to accord partially with Illumination. The two Professors of Oriental Languages and of the Old Testament, J. D. Michaelis and Eichhorn, are the only exceptions, the former, one of those worldly-minded supernaturalists, who gives up the *soul* of religion to the Philistines, satisfied if he can retain the *skin*; the other if possible in a still greater degree, destitute of all interest in religion, and only solicitous about historical and critical investigations. They are the first of that class of theologians, who with absolute indifference to the Church, to whose service they have been called as teachers of theology, give their attention only to abstract science and scholarship. During the last two decades, the principles of Illumination have penetrated into all Lutheran Faculties, and only a few representatives of orthodoxy, who have remained either more or less unaffected by its influence, allow their feeble voices here and there to be heard.

5. *The Reformed and Catholic Universities.* The number of *Reformed* High-schools was but limited, and many of

these were closed during the Thirty Years' War. Heidelberg was laid waste in 1622, restored in 1629 by the Elector of Bavaria as a Catholic University, began in 1652 after the war again to flourish, in 1686 was brought again under the sway of a royal family of the Catholic faith, and their efforts were constantly directed to making the existence of Protestantism as miserable as possible. Deprived of their rights, with their revenues decreased, the theological Faculty maintained only a sorrowful existence, besides all this in 1707, seven Jesuits were introduced as Professors, and it was only in 1803, that the University was restored by Charles Frederick; and the Catholic Professors, who still remained, were removed to Freiburg. Marburg in 1624 fell into the hands of the Upper Hessian Lutheran line, and was restored again in 1653, after the close of the war, to the Reformed Lower Hessian line. Frankfort had a merely nominal existence, during the war, having had from 1633 but a single theological Professor. Herborn also from 1629 was closed. At the close of the 16th century, in the time of its greatest prosperity, Heidelberg could boast of a number of distinguished Professors, Paræus, Alting, Keckermann, and was regarded as the best of the Reformed High-schools, being frequently attended also by Lutherans. The type of doctrine maintained by it, at this time, was the strict Calvinistic. Even after the restoration, Heidelberg possessed in Hottinger, Jacob Fabricius, illustrious theologians, yet not of the strict confessional stamp. Marburg had sent to Dort, at the request of the Margrave, and even after the war, the Marburg deputies represented at the Cassel Colloquium, the stricter type of doctrine of the Reformed, though they were of an accommodating and tolerant character. The Reformed church and theology did not undergo a transition through Pietism to Illumination, doubtless for this reason, that it already possessed that practical biblical character, for which Pietism in the Lutheran Church was first obliged to contend. In the same way we may explain the fact, that a steadfast opposition was made, by the Reformed church and theology, to Rationalism. Marburg had, even in the second half of the century, representatives of Reformed Orthodoxy, such as Endemann, Coing, Wyttenbach; and where these disappeared, at least a pious Supernaturalism maintained itself, as Frankfort, Herborn, Duisburg, Hamm; and where this was wanting, a churchly decorum: Freethinkers, as Edelmann.

Basodew and Bahrt are not to be found among the Reformed theologians.

In the *Catholic Church*, the fear was awakened even in the minds of the Fathers of the Synod of Trent, that the University education of their theologians was not a sufficient guarantee for their churchly character ; hence the Decree for the establishment of Episcopal *Seminaries*, and especially schools for boys in the different Dioceses. Yet this was never brought into general practice, in the Catholic territories. Until the middle of the preceding century, the want was less sensibly felt, as the Catholic Faculties knew how to resist successfully all innovations. Yet during the second half of it and afterwards, even the Catholic Church was not able to withdraw itself entirely from the overpowering influence of the spirit of Illumination. Josephinism and Illumination triumphed at the Universities of Vienna, Freiburg, Landshut, and in 1802, also at Bonn and Maintz, under archiepiscopal nurture. In consequence of the re-organization of the Catholic Church, after the wars for liberty, competent, well-educated teachers were appointed, by the exertions of the ruling authorities, also in the Catholic academies. In place of the mediæval or Jesuistical mode of instruction, a new one, more in accordance with the present condition of literary culture, was introduced, and many Catholic Faculties, as Bonn, Breslau, Freiburg, Tübingen, Giessen, emulated the Protestant ones, in the cultivation of theological science. But as the bishops began to see increasing dangers, in this culture, for the hierarchical, churchly spirit of those intended to be priests, they urged with greater earnestness the erection of clerical Seminaries, or Boarding-schools, and in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, the suppression of the flourishing Faculty at Giessen was effected, for the promotion of the interests of the Episcopal Seminary.

## ARTICLE III.

*Some of the Mistakes of Educated Men: The Biennial Address before the Pennsylvania Society of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa. By JOHN S. HART, LL. D. Delivered September 18, 1861. Philadelphia: C. Sherman & Son.*

By S. AUSTIN ALLIBONE, LL. D., Philadelphia.

Dr. Hart has certainly had sufficient experience in the manufacture of "educated men" to enable him to "speak with authority." He refers in this Address to the career of "more than four thousand young men who have been under his care as an educator." This is indeed "an exceeding great army" for good or evil; and he who has had so large a share in training it for the battle of life and the awards of eternity, may well feel gravely under the pressure of so great a responsibility. Evidences of such conscientious preceptorship are very observable in this Address to the Students of Pennsylvania College. The topics are skilfully chosen and clearly illustrated; the advice of the most practical, and, therefore, most useful kind; the exhortations are earnest, fraternal and affectionate.

The young man who heard this Address unmoved, who was not the better by, at least, some good resolutions, by the stirrings of a noble ambition to "act well his part" on the field of action for which he had girded up his loins, is not likely by his future career to make a father proud, a mother happy, or a fellow-man the better for his existence. In his counsels, Dr. Hart wisely "begins at the beginning," which is more than can be said for some orators on such occasions, whose "beginnings," "middles" and "ends" could be made to change places with as little suspicion on the part of the hearers as that entertainment by good Mr. Shields, who commended so warmly the poetical performance of which the reader, Dr. Johnson, had purposely omitted every other line. "The first advice, then, that I have to give you," says our speaker, "is *that you take care of your bodily health.*" From

a large acquaintance with literary and professional men, and after a careful survey of the whole subject, it is my sober judgment that more educated men fail of distinction through the want of bodily vigor than from any other cause. The high prizes in any of the professions are not to be won without exhausting labor. We talk a great deal about genius. What we say is no doubt all very fine. But, much as it may seem to you to be letting the subject down, depend upon it, you will not go far astray practically, if you define genius to be an extraordinary capacity for labor. I know well enough that such a definition does not exhaust the idea. But I have taken some pains to investigate the problem of the productions of genius, and the nearer in any given case I have been able to get at the very interior essence of things, the more have I been satisfied that no world-wide genius was ever achieved, except where there has been a prodigious capacity for work. Genius, at least that kind which achieves greatness, is not fitful. It has an iron will as well as an eagle eye. \* \* \* \* Now it is obvious that, in order to any such career, the body must have adequate powers of endurance. \* \* \* I dwell upon this point, and emphasize it, because on every side of me, in professional life, and especially in the clerical profession, I see so many helpless, hopeless wrecks. Verily there is some grievous mistake among us in this matter. Whether it be our climate, or our habit of student life, or our social and domestic habits, I am not prepared to say. But of the fact I make no doubt. Our educated men do not achieve half that they might achieve for the want of the necessary physical vigor. It is painful to see the dyspeptic, sore-throated, attenuated, cadaverous, specimens of humanity that student-life so often produces among us—men afraid of a puff of air, afraid of the heat, afraid of the cold, afraid to eat a piece of pie or good roast beef—men obliged to live on stale bread and molasses, who take cold if they get wet, who must make a reconnoissance of a room to see that they can secure a place out of a draft before they dare to take a seat—men who by dint of coaxing and nursing and pampering drag out a feeble existence for a few short years, and then drop into a premature grave—martyrs to intellectual exertion! \* \* \* \* We must live more in the open air than we do. We must warm our blood less by closed rooms and air-tight stoves, and more by oxygen breathed upon the beautiful hill-sides. We must spend more time in innocent outdoor amusements. We must cease to



count gunning and boating and bowling among the seven deadly sins. When a professional man is exhausted by intellectual labor, it is not in a dismal, solitary walk to recuperate him. Better let him pull off his coat and join the young folks on the green in some kind of honest game. Let him take a real hearty romp with the children. Let him have a little thoughtless fun. It will do him infinitely more good than lonely walks or swinging at dumb-bells." pp. 89, 11, 12, 13.

We like all this save the contemptuous manner in which the "solitary walk" and the "swinging at dumb-bells" are cashiered. Doubtless the "gunning, boating and bowling" are better than the "dumb-bells," the "romp on the green with the young folks" to be preferred to the "dismal, solitary walk,"—but, alas! the most of our literary men are "in populous city pent;" they have neither "guns," "boats," nor "bowls," nor the skill to use them; they have no "greens to romp on," and in many cases, no "young folks to romp with." It is with such, then, unless, indeed, they be pupils of the gymnasium, the "solitary walk" and the "dumb-bells," or no exercise:—for the few squares occasionally travelled from necessity, hardly deserve this name. So far, then, from depreciating these modes of relief and recuperation, we would earnestly urge them as a duty upon all students,—indeed, upon all whose occupations are of a sedentary character. Let there be a stated hour for the walk; let it be raised to the dignity of a duty; and permit nothing, save urgent necessity, to interfere with its performance. We have now in our mind the cases of two acquaintances who display, positively and negatively, the importance of the daily walk. The one, for many years a captive in his well-stored library, taking sweet counsel with the sages, philosophers, historians and poets of all ages, was assailed by those disorders which, sooner or later, punish those who transgress the laws of the physical economy. Friendly exhortation proved insufficient to arouse him to a just sense of his danger, and he was laid low just at the time when it was hoped that he was ready to communicate to the world the results of those studies which he had loved and pursued "not wisely but too well!" The scholars of many portions of the land, and of other lands, lamented his untimely fall, but few knew the impressive lesson this taught to those familiar with the truth. An elegant scholar, a profound student of classic lore and historic page, a delightful companion, a loving husband,

a good citizen—but all this availed nothing, so long as the machinery was permitted to rust by inaction.

The other picture is that of a scholar, the senior by twenty years of the first named; a graduate of Harvard of the class of 1797, the head of the Bar in his own city, if not at the head of his profession in America, who leaves his library every morning for the benefit of that exercise in the open air which we trust will still prolong an honorable life (already protracted beyond four score and five) for many years to come. At that hour—pre-occupied by a standing engagement devoted to those atmospheric influences which have proved so healthful—no visitor is received and no business entertained: the *walk* is the “business” of the hour. And, believe me good reader, half resolved to test the advantages of a daily excursion, *you* must be as stringent in your resolution. Let not every trifle—let nothing save a great and pressing duty—cause you to lose, or to postpone—which will generally be to lose—your daily walk. The physical benefit of the mere motion is quite sufficient to repay you for the time invested in the operation. The exercise “promotes a mutual action of both solids and fluids: it increases animal heat, by the same law of nature that the electric globe, in whirling round, collects fire: it invigorates the heart: occasions an equal distribution of the blood, and other circulating fluids, through the whole vascular system,—consequently promotes every secretion: it tends to augment the tone and vigor of the muscular fibres, whereby the nervous energy becomes greater, and increases the action of the stomach with respect to appetite and digestion: most powerfully obviates a plethoric state, or too great a fulness of the vessels; as well as assists a vegetable diet in removing it when present: it likewise renders the body less liable to malignant influences, or to the attacks of putrid diseases.” Dr. Squirrell: *Essay on Indigestion and its Consequences*.

Again: “*Exercitium natura dormientis stimulatio membrorum solutium, morborum medela, fuga citiorum, medicina languorum, Extractio omnium malorum.*” *Gordonius de Conserv. Vit. Hom. Lib. I. c. 7.*

“Guy Patin,” says Lord Chesterfield, “recommends to a patient to have no doctor but a horse, and no apothecary but an ass.”

Dr. Fuller considers horse riding the best because “a mixed exercise, partly active and partly passive, while other works, such as walking, running, stooping, or the like, re-

quire some labor and more strength for their performance." *Medicina Gymnastica.*

Dr. Cheyne remarks that "walking, though it will answer the same end yet it is more laborious and tiresome." The English Malady.

To many, doubtless, horse-riding "is more laborious and tiresome" than walking: but these modes of exercise should be used alternately:—where the horse is at hand, at command, and neither lame nor alllicted with any of those "ills", to which, either from "inheritance," or casualty, horses seem peculiarly liable. The *leys* are always "on hand," (to use a slight Hibernicism), generally at command," and require neither saddle, bridle, nor bit, nor a weekly settlement for provender; no small deduction from stipend of a Rector, the moderate salary of an Editor, or the meagre earnings of a Reviewer.

Dr. Hart prejudices the case, when he holds up to our reprobation the "dismal, solitary walk."

"Solitary" we suppose the walk will often be, for convenience and congeniality will seldom concur in favoring one with a desirable companion,—and solitude is greatly preferable to uncongenial or controversial companionship: but that a "solitary walk" should be "dismal," we see no necessity. The excursionist in "*L'Allegro*," though "not unseen," seems to have been unaccompanied, and he, certainly, was not "dismal," and "*Il l'enserosa*," the Melancholy Man, preferred to be solitary; and we always suspected him, notwithstanding his affected stoicism and philosophizing, to be enjoying himself greatly. Indeed, to many there are few greater pleasures than a "solitary walk" in the fields, the woods, or even the thoroughfares of a great city. And here we could enlarge, but that this is not the place for enlargement. Let it be understood, however, that we entirely concur in Dr. Hart's preference for sport to walks: we are only seeking to leave "without excuse" those who, lacking opportunities or tastes for the former, are disposed to justify themselves in the omission of the latter.

As to the number of hours per day of intellectual labor, which may safely precede or follow the daily walk, or walks, a man's knowledge of his own constitution, his experience of results, and "the kind of labor performed must guide to a decision—only let it be a decision,"—not a vague, nerveless intention. Let the workman say—So many hours I will seclude myself in my library, deny myself to all comers, and

devote myself to the preparation of my sermon, my book, my essay or to my studies. At such and such hours my parishioners, friends, acquaintances, strangers or bores (to which last class, alas! almost all of the members of the former classes seem at times naturally to gravitate can see me but during my library hours they *cannot* see me. They will soon come to understand this; and if they are considerate and reasonable, will approve of this system: if they are inconsiderate and unreasonable, their censure will be no reproach, and their estrangement no loss.

What a mistake there is here,—and what embarrassment and inconvenience result from the mistake! viz.: the conviction entertained by some dear, kind people that it is their duty to cheer the solitude of their minister or literary friend by passing an hour or two with him every few weeks! If they could read the heart, see the face, hear the exclamation (impatience tempered by piety or politeness,) of the visited, when the visitor's name is announced to the pastor hard at work at his next Sunday's discourse, or the author laboriously revising his last chapter, they would be less lavish of their well-meant but most injudicious attendance.

But how many hours should be ordinarily given to head work by one in good health? For occasional efforts, ten hours is not too much; to daily recurring, yearly continued, literary toil, not more than eight to nine hours should be devoted. There is an impression abroad that divines and other students, as a general rule, devote too much time to their books. We doubt this: perhaps few men after leaving college spend more than four to six hours daily in hard study,—and this is too little. If the reader thinks that we understate the truth, so far as he is concerned, at least, let him for a day or two keep a careful account of the hours devoted to hard work—reading or writing—and compare the aggregate per diem with his somewhat loose computation or rather guess, on this subject. Let him deduct from this suppositious sum the time lost over the newspapers, or in unnecessary letter-writing, and in the reception of those moths of time, people who “just step in to see how you are” and he will be no longer surprised at the slow progress in the library. The stories in books of literary anecdotes, current in the newspapers, and worn threadbare in the author's corners of social entertainment, of pale students drying up the sources of life by ten or twenty years of daily absorption in



some great work, will bear large discounts when closely examined.

Gibbon is ranked among the very chiefest of laborious scholars, and undoubtedly he performed a great work : but he took plenty of time to do it in, and took things, save in the conclusion of the last volume, much at his ease. He calls "The" Decline and Fall "the labor of six quartos and twenty years" (Miscel. Works, ed. 1837, p. 89,) but his own Autobiography enables us to reduce his figures very considerably.

We have been at some pains to compute the time actually bestowed upon the preparation and composition of this noble monument of human genius, and give the following as the result :

Vol. I. Years.	Vols. II. & III. Years.	Vols. IV., V. & VI. Years.
1768	1778	1782
1769	1779	$\frac{1}{2}$ of 1783
$\frac{1}{2}$ of 1770	1780	$\frac{1}{2}$ of 1784
$\frac{1}{2}$ of 1771	—	1785
$\frac{1}{2}$ of 1772	3	1786
1773	Less $\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$ of 1787
1774		
1775		
<hr/> 6 $\frac{1}{2}$	<hr/> 21 $\frac{1}{2}$	<hr/> 41 $\frac{1}{2}$ = 131 $\frac{1}{2}$

Of say six hours each day, or ten  $\frac{13}{10}$  years of eight hours a day. We say six hours a day, on an average, on the following evidence of the historian himself : "Happily for my eyes, I have always closed my studies with the day, and commonly with the morning ; and a long but temperate, labor has been accomplished without fatiguing either the mind or body." Miscell. Works, p. 107.

Not so leisurely laboured the doughty Prynne : "He," says Anthony Wood, "may well be entitled Voluminous Prynne, as Tostatus Albulensis was 200 years before his time called Voluminous Tostatus : for I verily believe, that if rightly computed, he wrote a sheet for every day of his life, reckoning from the time when he came to the use of reason and the state of man. His custom when he studied was to put on a long quilted cap which came an inch over his eyes, serving as an umbrella to defend them from too much light ; and seldom eating a dinner, would every three hours



for more he maunching a roll of bread, and now and then refresh his exhausted spirits with ale brought to him by his servant." Wood's Athen. Oxon., Bliss's ed., III 852.

Of the learned Matthew Pool, Calamy tells us, "his common rule was to rise very early in the morning, about three or four o'clock; and take a raw egg about eight or nine, and another about twelve, and then continue his studies till the afternoon was pretty far advanced, when he went abroad and spent the evening at some friend's house in cheerful conversation," in which "he was very facetious, as well as very true to his friend." And this reference to the compiler of the "*Synopsis Criticorum*" may well remind us of another great bibliclist, Edmund Castell, who says, "I considered that day as idle and dissatisfactory in which I did not toil sixteen or eighteen hours either at the *Polyglot* or *Lexicon*."

Abraham Sharp, the mathematician, Flamsteed's invaluable colleague, was another hard worker and a determined enemy of bores,—whom, indeed, he took good care should never get inside the house. His only two regular visitors, a mathematician and an apothecary of Little Horton, when they wished to see him, signified their presence by rubbing a stone against a certain part of the outside wall of the house." If Sharp preferred an outside to an inside "rubber," he let them rub on, or seek a more hospitable door.—He was very irregular in his meals, and "sparing in his diet, which he frequently took in the following manner: A little square hole, something like a window, made a communication between the room where he was usually employed in calculations, and another chamber or room in the house where a servant could enter; and before this hole he had contrived a sliding board: the servant always placed his victuals in this hole without speaking or making any the least noise; and when he had a little leisure he visited his cupboard to see what it afforded to satisfy his hunger or thirst. But it often happened, that his breakfast, dinner, and supper, had remained untouched by him, when the servant has gone to remove what was left—so deeply engaged had he been in his calculations."

Robert Hall would sometimes sit intensely engaged in thought for more than twelve hours in the day, so that "when one or two of his kind friends have called upon him, in the hope of drawing him from his solitude, they have found him in such a state of nervous excitement as led them to unite their efforts in persuading him to take some

could narcotic and retire to rest." The punishment of this excess is well known. The melancholy examples of Colonel Garwood and Hugh Miller will readily occur to the mind. Of our American scholars, Hugh Legare also fell a victim to this habit of long abstraction preventing as it did the opportunities for that exercise the importance of which Dr. Hart urges on his readers. That Legare thus brought on that painful disease which cut him short under the roof of a hospitable friend in Boston, we know from the testimony of his medical adviser in Charleston. When he was at his studies abroad, Mr. Preston says that "on one occasion he found himself at breakfast on Sunday morning, on the same seat where he had breakfasted the day before—not having quitted it meantime."

Mr. Prescott was a wiser man: his habits are well known and have become better known through the pen of the eminent scholar to whom we have just alluded as the kind host of Hugh Legare.

Washington Irving took his "ease" in his library as well as in his "inn,"—but when working in another man's library, as in Mr. Rich's in Madrid, or when he heard the sound of the printer's feet behind him, he could use great expedition. In a conversation with him in 1857 we happened to call his attention to De Quincey's assertion that "few men could devote more than six hours a day to intellectual exertion," but we remarked that we knew better than that, and that he must know better also. "Yes," he responded, "I have worked fourteen hours a day." That he was a conscientious annalist need hardly be repeated. Being at Sunnyside in the Summer of 1855, we quoted Boswell's declaration that in composing his *Life of Johnson* he was sometimes obliged to "run half over London for a date." "Well," replied Irving, "I have been all this morning looking for a date. And when you have your facts, they must be prepared for the reader. When you have the skeleton you must put the soul in it. My great object is to be perfectly plain and intelligible. People talk of 'writing up,'—my difficulty is to write down. \* \* \* \* Writing history is a very different thing from writing fiction. You have such trouble with dates and facts."

Of the prospects of the circulation of his *Life of Washington*, on which he was then engaged, he was by no means

sanguine. Mr. Putnam, his publisher then present, had predicted that 50,000 copies would be sold sooner or later: the writer of this article raised the figures to a hundred thousand. "Hear him talk of thousands!" exclaimed Irving.— "I do not see how he can sell one thousand. It used to be a great matter to sell a thousand copies of a work." We presume that the largest number named has been reached long since.

Dr. Hart's second piece of advice to the Students of Pennsylvania College is to acquire *the habit of being beforehand with whatever you undertake*, p. 14. Teaching his "philosophy by examples," he instances as a "ready man" and "a full man" the late Dr. Murray, of Elizabeth, N. J., whose testimony it was "that he spent usually the entire morning of five days, never less than four days, in the composition of a sermon, and that he was never without at least three finished sermons ahead." "It is a recorded fact," says the lecturer, "that after his death there were found in his desk no less than four finished sermons, fully written out, which had never been preached, besides a fifth sermon already on the stocks. I am informed that he has had at times as many as eight sermons ahead. The Doctor moreover, was abundant in other labors in the pen. He wrote several books. He wrote many popular lectures and addresses. He wrote almost every week an article for the New York Observer, filling from one to two columns of that paper. He was a frequent attendant upon ecclesiastical councils of various kinds, and upon literary festivals such as the present. Yet he never seemed to be in a hurry, never pressed for time. He had all the comfort of a gentleman of leisure. It was simply because he early found, and ever adhered to, the habit of being beforehand with every engagement." pp. 14, 16.

It is very evident, then, that the good Doctor adhered to the rule which we have already commended to our student,—that is, to permit no interference with the hours appropriated to the library:—to run the risk of losing an unreasonable acquaintance whose place can easily be replaced (if replacement be desirable,) rather than incur the certain loss of priceless hours which can never be recalled. Have the courage to say "No!"—it is a rarer gift than is generally supposed. Do not paint Cotton Mather's "BE SHORT" over your library door—for how few have the good sense and good manners

to "be short!" Adopt a better motto: "BE ABSENT," for instance, strikes us as an improvement.

In this matter of being "beforehand with what is undertaken," our preacher, (Dr. Hart) has earned a right to give advice to others, for he assures us that in an almost uninterrupted connection with the press for twenty years, it is his boast that he has "never kept a printer waiting for an hour." p. 18. Few of us can say as much: though, doubtless, the public would have been no losers if some of us had "kept the printer waiting" for many hours,—for ever.

The Doctor next advises his students (p. 18) to *hold on to the calling or profession which they choose*,—most wholesome counsel to a people so given to change as the Americans.

"Of course," he says, "one may make so foolish a choice, may err so egregiously in the first step, that to retrace it, and begin anew at something else, is indispensable. In this matter no absolute rule is possible. The tendency however is very strong in one direction. Where one man perseveres in a calling that he ought to abandon, a dozen men abandon their calling who ought to stick to it. It is not difficult to account for this. All those kinds of business which are surest in the end, which pay best in the long run, are slowest in the beginning, to yield a return. The young lawyer or physician has to creep along at first at a most discouraging pace. In those early years of professional probation, when the man is hardly earning his salt, some other business opens before him that promises an immediate income,—something that will bring him at once two or three times what he is now receiving. The temptation is strong indeed." pp. 18-19.

For the encouragement of our "briefless barristers" and patientless doctors, let us illustrate Dr. Hart's text by a few instances of the wisdom of "continuing in that state whereunto one is called."

At the age of fifteen years, little William Blackstone was at the head of his school—The Charter House of which he had been an inmate since his seventh or eighth year. In his seventeenth year he was entered a commoner of Pembroke College, Oxford, there pursued his studies for three years; and subsequently applied himself to the law for five years. He had now lived twenty three years, for sixteen of which he had been under training for the business of life. This can hardly be called inefficient preparation:—expectations of moderate success were surely not unreasonable. Yet



from 1746, the year in which he was called to the Bar, to the year 1760 he reports only two cases in which he was engaged and these were not of sufficient note to be recorded in any report book save his own. As to "paying office expenses," that, after some years of this hard experience, was too extravagant an idea to be entertained for a moment. And yet from his admission, to Michaelmas Term in 1750, four years, he had regularly attended the Court of King's Bench and taken notes of cases. Under this adverse state of affairs did the "briefless barrister" seek another calling? By no means:—he still continued his pursuit of his proverbially "jealous mistress," and in time, though in other branches of his profession, he was rewarded with her choicest favors.—His brilliant success—is it not written in the resolute hearts of many a struggling yet determined successor to which it has been inspiration, courage and experience?

Lord Eldon's early hardships have become familiar to the world through the volumes of Horace Twiss. It was his habit to rise every morning at four to master the foundations of the law. When reading at night he would bind a wet towel around his head to check any tendency to drowsiness. A medical friend remonstrated:—"No matter," says Scott, "I must do as I am now doing or starve." At last, in January, 1766, he was called to the Bar,—and now "hope elevates and joy brightens his crest." "When I was called to the bar," he remarks to his niece, "Bessy [his wife] and I thought all our troubles were over: business was to pour in, and we were to be almost rich immediately. So I made a bargain with her, that during the following year all the money I should receive in the first eleven months should be mine, and whatever I should get in the twelfth month should be hers. What a stingy dog I must have been to make such a bargain! I would not have done so afterwards. But however, so it was; that was our agreement: and how do you think it turned out? In the twelfth month I received half a guinea; eighteen pence went for fees, and Bessy got nine shillings: in the other eleven months I got not one shilling." *Twiss's Life of Eldon*, I. 100.

Towards the close of his life, as the great man was passing through Cursitor Street with his Secretary, remembrance of the days of poverty, was awakened by familiar scenes. He paused: "Here," said he, "was my first perch. How often have I run down to Fleet Market with a sixpence in my hand, to buy sprats for supper."



As a contrast to this "sixpence story" we present the following significant line from the Obituary notice of his lordship in the *Gentlemen's Magazine*, March, 1838, p. 320. "The personal property has been sworn to be under 700,000 l."

Sir Samuel Romilly—but "the time would fail to tell," and our portion of this number of the *Review* would fail to hold, the twentieth part of "the noble army" of those whom industry, energy, perseverance and the favor of God "have brought from straitness of bread to a large and wealthy place."

We pass over Dr. Hart's fourth head, *Have some fresh intellectual acquisition always on hand*, and his fifth head—Avoid the mistake of limiting too strictly your studies to your own particular sect or caste (the excellence of which counsel must commend itself to the assent of every sensible reader), to allow ourselves a few lines of hearty endorsement of the last topic of this admirable address.

VI. The importance of *cultivating the art of conversation*. p. 31.

We have few good talkers in America, and the chief cause is obvious: we have few good listeners: and the existence of the latter is a necessary condition of the existence of the former. The literary soil of England, and the same may be said of that of France, is favorable to the growth of conversationists. At the "Holland Houses," great and small, of London, when a man eminent for his knowledge, and known to be skilled in the art of imparting that knowledge, makes his appearance he naturally takes the lead in conversation, "and the people like to have it so." He is not interrupted by impertinence, distracted by impatience, nor chilled by a yawn; his eyes are not pained by listless inattention, nor his voice drowned by the untimely thunder of an orchestra. It is not considered out of place, but very much in place, that he who "gives his days and nights" to a particular department of knowledge, should communicate some of the results of his studies to those not so well informed. The *Napier*s can talk of battles and sieges and Macaulay of Claverhouse and the Covenanters, De Morgan of mathematics, Airy of asteroids, and Charles Babbage of calculating machines, without being ridiculed as pedants and avoided as bores. Is it so in America? Here we have no kings *de se à se*, and every man talketh what nonsense "seemeth best."

to his own ears. Cooper somewhere says that an American would consider himself very deficient if he could not talk upon every subject, at any time, at a moment's notice. Is not this too true? What chance would Conversation Sharpe, or Mackintosh, or Coleridge, or Macaulay or Maginn have had in America? We do not name Johnson for he would have forced his way: Nay, sir, you have asked my opinion and you shall hear it!" or, "Sir, you are shamefully ignorant of the first principles of what you are attempting to teach! You give us sound without sense, and declamation without argument!" "Oh, for an hour" of Johnson, in every so-called literary circle of our country!

To present an idea in its full light, perhaps in several lights, to institute a historical parallel, or develope a truth in philosophy, ethics, religion, or even politics, requires some little time: and no man or woman worth hearing will attempt either of these things when morally certain of being instructed by socialism or bullied by dogmatism at every other sentence. Want of humility here, as in every thing else, is the foe to improvement. Men had rather remain ignorant than gain knowledge by an admission of ignorance; and he who corrects their ignorance by his knowledge, is deemed their "enemy" because he has "told them the truth." Let one of the smatterers pronounce any absurdity in letters, morals, ethics, or religion, and he will be found restive under instruction, communicated, perhaps, from a sense of duty, in the kindest and most considerable manners."

"VII. Deem it not below the dignity of the occasion that I urge upon you *the duty of cultivating good manners.*" p. 36.

Such is the last head of advice in the Address before us.

Perhaps in the remarks just made we have to some extent anticipated the subject; nor have we space to enlarge upon the theme, important as it is.

If any man need to be reminded of the importance of good manners, let him remember that day when warmed by the affecting appeals of the preacher, or the eloquent exhortations of the author, he made haste to the supposed sympathizing friend of the vestry room, or the library to find a repulsive icicle, or a chattering, egotistical buffoon. Dr. Hart instances the late Joseph John Gurney as a specimen of faultless manners, and we can bear witness from our own recollections of that excellent man, that he has not

overdrawn the portrait, no not "in the estimation of a hair." Mr. Gurney was, indeed, the beau ideal of a Christian gentleman. But we need not go to England for specimens. Boston itself being witness. Our Southern brethren esteem themselves peculiarly well off in this description of produce—finished gentleman—and though we consider their manners of late not entirely beyond criticism, those who remember the bearing and conversation of Major Davezac, Captain Upshur, and many others, living and deceased, who could be named, will feel another pang added to the bitterness of fratricidal strife: necessary and inevitable, as the madness of Secession has made that strife.

Nor does our lecturer fail to direct the attention of his students to the best school of good manners.

"That which I recommend to you is not to be won from the dancing master or the tailor. No one can be insensible to the charms of graceful posture, movement, and costume. But the charm of manner of which I have been speaking, lies deeper than these. It is no outside varnish. It springs from real goodness of heart, from a life hid with Christ in God. It is Christian charity clothing itself spontaneously in fitting external expression. It gives beauty to the plainest face, it teaches winning words and ways to the most ignorant. \* \* \* \* If then you would have truly good manners, in their very highest type, seek first of all goodness and purity of heart. Be filled with a kind and loving spirit. Drink largely of that charity which doth not behave itself unseemly, and which seeketh not her own, which suffereth long and is kind. Good manners are only the natural expression of unselfish benevolence. If this be wanting, they are a cheat and a sham. But having this, you will not count the slightest article of dress, the most inconsiderable movement of the limbs or the person, the most trifling word or the most ordinary occasion as beneath your care and study if thereby you can add in any degree to the happiness of any human being." pp. 38, 39.

Thus having "thoroughly furnished" his student "to all good works," Dr. Hart dismisses him with his benediction to "act well his part" in the great battle of life. Well will be for him, well for his race—if he thus "serve his generation," and receive at last the commendation and the reward promised to "the good and faithful servant who knew and who performed his Master's will!"

## ARTICLE IV.

## OUR GENERAL SYNOD.

The Twenty-first Convention\* of the General Synod met in York, Pennsylvania, May 5th, 1861. The opening discourse, in the absence of the President of the last Convention, was delivered by Rev. Samuel Sprecher, D. D., of Springfield, Ohio, from Esther 4: 13, 14, "Then Mordecai commanded to answer Esther, Think not with thyself that thou shalt escape in the king's house, more than all the Jews. For if thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed: and who knoweth whether thou art come for such a time as this?" The subject presented was, "*The Responsibility of the Church in the present National Crisis.*" It was an interesting and able discussion and was listened to with marked attention by the large audience, convened on the occasion.

There are at present, twenty-nine District Synods, connected with the General Synod, from all of which, except the Synods of Virginia, Western Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Texas, delegates were present. As these Synods have neither announced their withdrawal nor been cut off, they may be regarded as a part of the General Synod, and the hope, cherished that, when the War has been brought to a conclusion and the country once more united, their representatives may again be found on the floor of Synod. We believe that many of our brethern in the South are still with us in sympathy, and that when the opportunity is offered, by the re-establishment of the Federal authority over that territory, they will be glad to renew their connection with the Northern Church and cordially co-operate with us in efforts to fulfil our high mission. Delegates from the Border States of Maryland and Kentucky were present. Two Synods, the Synod of Minnesota and the Franckean

*Officers.*—Samuel Sprecher, D. D., of Ohio, *President*; Prof. M. L. Stoeber, of Pennsylvania, *Secretary*; A. F. Ockershausen, Esq., of New York, *Treasurer*.

Synod made application for admission, and were received. When the roll was called one hundred and fifty (eighty five clerical and sixty five lay members,) answered to their names, the largest number of delegates ever in attendance at the General Synod, or at any Lutheran Convention in the United States. There were, also, ninety ministerial brethren, as well as prominent laymen from different sections of the Church, present, indicating the deep interest felt in the General Synod and the strong hold it has upon the affections of the Church.

The sessions were well attended, the congregations, assembled at public worship and the several anniversary services, were larger than we have ever known on any similar occasion, and the kind attentions and generous hospitalities of the citizens of York could not have been surpassed. They will long be held in grateful recollection. It was in many respects a most pleasant meeting of Synod, one that will be memorable in its history and fraught with important consequences. Some who anticipated its deliberations with trembling, regard the results which were reached with grateful joy. The General Synod we believe, occupies, this day, a stronger position than it has, since its organization. As its basis has been more clearly defined and its love for the venerable Confession of the Church, more explicitly expressed, new friends will rally around it, fresh acquisitions will be made from year to year and, we trust, that the day is not very remote when the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church of this country will be united under its banner.

The question, which awakened the deepest interest and elicited the most discussion was the

### *Reception of the Franckean Synod,*

and although the debate was animated and earnest, it was in general, conducted in a kind, fraternal and christian spirit. The discussion on the subject was thorough and able, and was participated in by Drs. Polhman, Baugher, C. W. Schaffer, Stork, Passavant, Harkey, Ziegler, Harrison, Sprecher, Rev. Messrs. Titus, Wedekind, Krotel, Hull, Welden, Bassler, Goodlin, Wenzel, Kunkelman, Senderling, Adlberg, Bolton, Neumann, Wieting, Van Alstine, Dr. Kemp, Hon. C. Kugler, J. J. Cochran, Esq., and others.



It was maintained, on the one side, that the Franckean Synod was Lutheran only in name, that it had a creed of its own, substituted for the Augsburg Confession, one that was inconsistent with the Church's doctrinal basis, and to which the Campbellites and other heretical sects in the West might subscribe; that this creed was evasive on points that were fundamental, that it contained nothing in its character that was distinctly Lutheran, that it made no reference to the Confession of the Church. It was also stated, that the Synod had deliberately, at its formation, ignored and set aside the Confession and that this action it had never yet repudiated.—Allusion was made to a judicial decision, given by Vice-Chancellor Sanford of the State of New York, in which he expressed the opinion that the Franckean Synod was not a Lutheran body. It was maintained that a most dangerous precedent would be established, if Lutheran Synods were allowed to form new creeds; that the faith of the Lutheran Church was settled, and that the General Synod itself had no power to make changes or introduce innovations into it; that the Augsburg Confession was essential to constitute us Lutherans, and that, therefore, the Franckean Synod could not constitutionally be admitted as an integral part of the General Synod until it received the Confession as an exponent of the fundamental truths of the Bible, as taught by our Church.

It was argued, on the other side, that the Franckean Synod had complied with the requirements of the General Synod, that it had, in adopting its Constitution, adopted its doctrinal basis, and that if there was anything in the creed which was at variance with the Confession, it was, by their recent action, revoked or superseded. It was asserted, that a direct recognition of the Augsburg Confession was not necessary for admission into the General Synod, as its Constitution does not even mention the name of the Confession; that the Franckean Synod had as virtually adopted it as the General Synod itself had, that the Synod was not so much in fault, as the Constitution of the General Synod was loose and indefinite. Their doctrinal views, it was said, should be compared with the Augsburg Confession; if they differ from it, the Synod should not be received; if they do not, there could be no objection to their reception. The Synod, it was believed, did teach the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, as they are taught by our Church, and its representatives, making application for admission, were sound in the faith.—

It was argued, that the principle, which would exclude the Franckean Synod, would cut off many of the District Synods, which do not in their Constitutions formally recognize the Augsburg Confession. Reference was also made to the origin and early history of the General Synod, to the views of the men who framed the Constitution and to the circumstances under which the New York Ministerium, the Hartwick and other Synods were received into the General Synod. The legal decision against the Lutheran character of the Franckean Synod, it was said, was entitled to no weight, inasmuch as Vice-Chancellor Sanford was not a Lutheran, and no theologian, and that in the State of Ohio in one of the Courts a legal opinion of an opposite bearing had been given; and that the civil authorities were not competent to determine questions, that related to the Church.—It was also stated, that the Synod used the General Synod's Hymn Book, contributed its funds to the support of our Foreign Missions and other benevolent operations of the Church, educated its students at Hartwick Seminary, that it was represented in its Board of Trustees and Visitors and interchanged delegates with the New York Ministerium and the Hartwick Synod. The delegates declared that they had presented themselves for admission with honest hearts, with an earnest desire to co-operate with their Lutheran brethren; that they desired to become a component part of the General Synod, that their usefulness, as a Synod, might be increased; that they were under the impression, when their Synod adopted the Constitution of the General Synod, they also adopted the Augsburg Confession, as received by the General Synod.

All in the Convention seemed anxious to admit the Synod, if it could be done consistently with duty. The only difference was that some of the brethren desired to postpone the application, until there was, in the Constitution of the Synod, a distinct recognition of the Augsburg Confession, whilst others were willing, as the delegates were on the ground and supposed that they had complied with the conditions required, to receive it at once, on the faith of the promise made, and with the express understanding that at the next meeting of the Synod, whatever informality there might have been in their proceedings, all room for doubt would be removed.

The Synod at first unanimously resolved that the Franckean Synod be admitted as an integral portion of the Gen

eral Synod, so soon as they shall give formal expression to their adoption of the Augsburg Confession, as received by the General Synod. This action was however, the next day, reconsidered and the whole subject finally disposed of by the adoption of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Franckean Synod be received into connexion with the General Synod, with the understanding that, at its next meeting it declare in an official manner, its adoption of the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession, as a substantially correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God.

Against this action of the General Synod Rev. Dr. C. W. Schaeffer and others felt it their duty to enter their earnest and respectful protest, disclaiming, at the same time, any disposition to impugn the motives of those who favored the application, and expressing high personal regard for the brethren of the Franckean Synod. The position assumed by the Protestants was (1) that the General Synod provides for the admission of regularly constituted Synods, that a regularly constituted Synod is one that "holds the fundamental doctrines of the Bible as taught by our Church," and that by universal consent, these doctrines so taught are expressed in the Augsburg Confession; that the whole history of the Franckean Synod presents it as having no relation or connexion whatever with the Augsburg Confession, and that in its official documents there is no evidence that it has ever accepted the Confession: (2) That the General Synod is forbidden by its Constitution "to introduce such alterations in matters appertaining to the faith as might in any way tend to burden the consciences of the brethren in Christ," and that they felt their consciences burdened by holding Synodical relations with a body that had set up a new doctrinal standard: (3) That the General Synod, in the spirit of its Constitution requires and prescribes certain conditions, as prerequisites to the admission of any Synod; that the Franckean Synod was admitted without a compliance with those conditions, and in doing so the Constitution had been violated and a precedent established which would be followed by the most lamentable results.

Dr. Schaeffer also presented a paper, signed by the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania, announcing that inasmuch as the Pennsylvania Synod at the time of its reunion with the General Synod had resolved that, if the General

Synod should violate its Constitution and require assent to any thing in conflict with the old and long established faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, their delegates be required to protest against such action, to withdraw from its sessions and to report to Synod, and as they regarded the admission of the Franckean Synod, as a direct violation of the Constitution of the General Synod, they were compelled to retire and to report to the body they represented.

These papers were both entered upon the Minutes as well as the answer to the Protest, prepared by a Committee consisting of Rev. Drs. Baugher and Harrison, and Dr. Kemp, who subsequently reported, that whilst they admitted that the Franckean Synod had not formally adopted the Augsburg Confession, yet they had formally adopted the Constitution of the General Synod, and their delegates had declared verbally, and in the most solemn manner in a written record that they believed that, in adopting the Constitution of the General Synod, they were adopting the doctrinal basis required, which is the Augsburg Confession; what these brethren affirm they believed they were really doing they hesitate not to declare their Synod will do formally at its next regular session; and that for the purpose of securing the ends of truth and righteousness, and to satisfy the minds of the doubting and fearful the resolution of the General Synod requires them to adopt in a formal manner the doctrinal basis of the Lutheran Church, viz., the Augsburg Confession, as containing the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God, or forfeit their connexion with this body. The Committee think (1) that, whilst confidence in the affirmed convictions of the Franckean Synod is conceded, the General Synod is secured against the introduction of a Synod into its body that is not Lutheran; (2) that the General Synod has not willingly or consciously violated the Constitution, or set up a new doctrinal standard for the admission of new Synods. (3) that the Franckean Synod had really, although not formally, complied with the conditions required by the Constitution. Inasmuch as the Constitution of the General Synod is indefinite, and a difference of opinion on the subject exists among the members of Synod, it was deemed best to yield the point, as had been done in the reception of other Synods, until the formal action required could be had, with the view of satisfying the consciences of some of the brethren, and more certainly harmonizing the whole Synod.



The withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Synod's delegates was greatly regretted, but there seemed to be no alternative, inasmuch as, in their judgment the Constitution had been violated, and the instructions of the Synod on this subject were so explicit. We indulge the hope, however, that it is only a temporary separation, and that the discussion on this question and the subsequent action of the General Synod will have a tendency to bind together more firmly the whole Church, and deepen its affection for the venerable Confession.

### *State of the Country.*

The most intense interest was manifested in reference to the State of our Country. This was strengthened from the fact that our Armies were then in motion and engaged in a fierce and sanguinary conflict. The sons of many of the brethren were in the field, and from nearly all our churches there were representatives, noble and patriotic men, mingling in the sad scenes, ready to make any sacrifice, or to meet death for the maintenance of our national life. At one of the first sessions of Synod, a resolution was passed to set apart one hour, the succeeding day, for humble, earnest prayer to Almighty God, in the name of Jesus, for the forgiveness of our national sins, for his blessing upon our Armies and Navy in the opening campaign, for victory in the coming struggle and for the speedy suppression of the Rebellion, and the restoration of peace to our distracted land. At the devotional services that were daily held in the Church, fervent supplication on behalf of our country ascended to the mercy seat. All seemed to realize the importance of the contest and our need of the Divine blessing. A committee, consisting of one from each District Synod, was also appointed to prepare a minute on the State of the Country and our duty, as Christians, in reference to it. The Committee through Rev. Dr. Passavant, subsequently presented a report which was unanimously adopted. We record the resolutions in full for future reference :

*Resolved*, That having assembled a second time, during the prevalence of Civil War in our land, this Synod cannot separate, without solemnly re-affirming the declarations adopted at our last Convention, in reference to the originating cause of the Rebellion, the necessity of its forcible suppression, the righteousness of the War which is waged by



the Government of the United States for the maintenance of the national life, and the consequent duty of every Christian to support it by the whole weight of his influence, his prayers and his efforts.

*Resolved*, That we acknowledge with profound gratitude to Almighty God, the various and important successes which have thus far crowned our arms; the merciful interposition of Providence in delivering us from the invasions of the enemy, and in protecting our homes, our churches and our Institutions from the desolations of war; and the cheering progress which has been made by the Government and the Nation, in the recognition of the laws of God and the rights of man, in the measures which have been adopted for the suppression of the Rebellion.

*Resolved*, That recognizing the sufferings and calamities of War, as the righteous judgments of a just God, visited upon us for our transgressions, we call upon our pastors and churches to unite with us in the confession of our many and grievous individual and national sins, and in fervent supplication for the Divine forgiveness, that as a people, we may break off sins by righteousness, and do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God.

*Resolved*, That as persistent efforts are making among us, by professedly Christian writers, to prove, from the Holy Scriptures, the Divine institution of American Slavery—the principal cause of this wicked Rebellion—we the delegates, of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, hereby express our unqualified condemnation of such a course, which claims the sanction of the merciful God and Father of us all for a system of human oppression, which exists only by violence, under the cover of iniquitous laws.

### *The Christian Commission.*

Rev. B. B. Hotchkiss, as a representative of the Christian Commission, was present and by invitation addressed the Convention on the character and work of that noble Institution. A resolution was unanimously adopted, expressive of the Synod's interest in its operations, especially in its successful combination of physical and spiritual help for the suffering according to the example and instruction of our Lord, the extensive and gratuitous services of Christian ministers and laymen under its guidance, the remarkable economy as

well as efficiency with which its work has been conducted and the still widening calls for its labors of love in our Armies. A special Committee was also appointed to report on the claims of the Commission and to present some plan, by which the contributions of our churches for the temporal and spiritual relief of our soldiers may be applied through this agency. Dr. Baugher from the Committee subsequently submitted a report, commending the operations of the Commission to our churches as a safe and successful channel for the preaching of the Gospel to our soldiers; proposing that monthly or quarterly collections be taken in our churches for the support of this truly Christian work; and recommending the formation of Relief Associations in every congregation for the purpose of procuring clothing, food, beverages and other articles, useful to the wounded and sick.

#### *United States Army Hospital, York, Pa.*

The Synod, having been invited to visit the United States General Hospital at York under the care of Dr. Henry Palmer, as Surgeon, and Rev. Dr. J. A. Brown as Chaplain, by a unanimous resolution on Saturday afternoon proceeded in a body to the grounds and were conducted by the officers through the establishment. This Hospital, from the commencement of the War, has been occupied by our wounded soldiers and accommodations are furnished for large numbers, whose interests, temporal and spiritual, seem well cared for. The Synod was very much gratified with its visit, and entered upon its minutes the following resolution :

*Resolved*, That this body express its great satisfaction with the order and neatness observed in the arrangements of the Hospital, the excellent discipline of the Surgeon in charge, and the fidelity and success of the Chaplain in his labors among the soldiers.

#### *American Tract Society.*

Rev. J. J. Marks, D. D., of the American Tract Society, Boston, and Rev. G. L. Shearer, of the American Tract Society, New York, were present and made interesting statements relative to the interests and operations of their respective Societies, particularly at the present time when a field for usefulness was opened in the Army and among the

Freedmen of our land. Both Institutions were cordially commended to the sympathy and support of our churches.

### *Ecclesiastical Correspondence.*

Rev. E. T. Senseman appeared as a delegate from the Northern Diocese of the Church of the United Brethren (or Moravian) Church, and Rev. B. B. Hotchkin, from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church with the cordial salutations of the bodies they represented. Both of them presented interesting statements in reference to the condition and prosperity of their own Churches, and assurances of the fraternal regard and sincere sympathy of their brethren with us in the work, in which we are engaged. A communication from Rev. B. Bausman, the delegate appointed by the General Synod of the German Reformed Church was read regretting his inability to be present and expressing the kind sentiments and friendly interest of his constituents.

The Synod appointed the following individuals, as our representatives to corresponding bodies, in accordance with the suggestions of the Committee on Ecclesiastical Correspondence, as reported through Rev. Dr. Harkey: *To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church*, S. Sprecher, D. D., *Primarius*, and Rev. D. Steck, *Alternate*: *To the General Synod of the German Reformed Church*—Rev. D. Steck, *Primarius*, and Prof. M. Diehl, *Alternate*: *To the Northern Diocese of the United Brethren (or Moravian) Church*—Rev. A. C. Wedekind, *Primarius*, and C. A. Hay, D. D., *Alternate*: *To the Evangelical Church Union of the West*, S. W. Harkey, D. D. *Primarius*, and W. H. Harrison, D. D., *Alternate*. The Committee on *Foreign Correspondence* for the ensuing two years consists of Rev. G. F. Krotel, H. N. Pohlman, D. D., A. H. Lochman, D. D., W. A. Passavant, D. D. and Rev. P. Sahm.

### *The German Population of our Country.*

Rev. Dr. Schmucker, from the Committee appointed at the last Convention to consider the condition of the German population in this country and to present some plan of co-operation among them, in a carefully prepared report represented the entire number of Germans amongst us of foreign birth at 4,000,000, about one third of whom (1,333,333) being Lutherans, or of Lutheran extraction. The tide of im-

migration has, of late years, chiefly tended towards the North Western portions of our country, viz., Wisconsin, whose population in 1860 was 15 *per cent.* German, Indiana, 14, Minnesota, 10, Illinois, Missouri, Ohio and California, each 7 *per cent.*, New York, 6, Pennsylvania, 4, whilst the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio still contain the largest population of German descent, although to a large extent Anglicized. Provision for the religious wants of our German population is less ample than many others. Our German Ministers on an average have charge of three or four congregations and can, therefore, devote only a limited portion of time to each. Of course pastoral visitation, meetings during the week. Catechetical instruction, the Bible Class and Sabbath school can receive only partial attention. To meet the wants of our German brethren, (1) A prominent place should be assigned to the increase of German Schools, and to the establishment of congregational schools under the direction of the pastor and Church Council: (2) One or more Normal Schools should be established for the education of well-qualified teachers who can instruct both in the German and the English languages: (3) A correspondence should be opened and sustained between our German Synods and the Missionary Seminaries and Societies of Germany in order to secure the services of more men of proper qualifications for the American field: (4) Suitable efforts should be made to circulate more extensively a sanctified religious literature among our German population: (5) All our churches both English and German should devote a liberal portion of their religious donations to the objects proposed.

The Synod, impressed with the conviction that the Lutheran Church in this country can and ought to make greater efforts than she has hitherto done to supply the religious wants of this large, increasing and destitute portion of our population, the German immigrants, unanimously adopted the recommendations of the Committee.

### *Narrative on the State of the Church.*

From the Report on the State of the Church, presented by Rev. Joel Swartz on behalf of the Committee of one from each District Synod, we learn that (1) the cause of piety, in connexion with every other interest, has greatly suffered during the War. Very many of our young men have enlisted in their Country's service, some have fallen on



the battle-field and others, exposed to the dangers of the camp, have yielded to the influence of temptation. One obvious effect of the War is the abstraction of men and means from the Church and a diminution of her energies.—The Church has suffered in spiritual life and power. The public mind has been withdrawn from the subject of religion and distracted by the general and preternatural excitement that has prevailed: (2) Yet the Word and the Sacraments have been administered with fidelity and, in many instances, with great success. In some sections there have been large additions made to the membership of the Church. The time-honored custom of Catechization is regarded with increased favor throughout the Church. The means of preparing the baptized children of the Church for an intelligent profession of faith in Christ and the privileges of communicant membership had, in many places, fallen into neglect on account of its frequent abuse in the hands of those who employed it as a mere formal method of introducing the young to the Communion without any evidence of piety. Pastoral visitation continues to be highly valued as a means of edification to believers and of religious awakening to many who resist the public exhibition of the Divine Word: (3) Sunday Schools are multiplying and increasing in efficiency. From the extensive circulation of our English and German Sunday School papers the Committee entertain the hope that, whilst the Sunday School is employed among us as an agency to build up Christ's kingdom, it may specially tend to promote the interests of the Lutheran Church: (4) Whilst our ordinary benevolent operations may have suffered, channels for the benefactions of the Church have opened in other directions. The various agencies, organized for the relief of our patriotic soldiers, have received liberally the means of the Church. The spirit of benevolence has rather been strengthened, as the demands for its exercise have been extended: (5) The institutions of learning and religion in the Church are represented as in a healthful condition. Some of them have suffered in consequence of the War. During the Rebel invasion of Pennsylvania, which led to the terrific conflict at Gettysburg, the grounds and buildings of our College and Seminary greatly suffered, but these calamities only revealed the deep interest of the Church in these Institutions whilst she promptly and spontaneously contributed her means to repair the losses sustained. Our Western Institutions have also passed through severe trials peculiar to the times.



but there is no reason for discouragement. It is believed that the difficulties, through which we are now passing will be overruled for good, for the advancement of the Church and the glory of God.

*The Theological Seminary of the General Synod at Gettysburg, Pa.*

Rev. F. W. Conrad, President of the Board of Directors, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, presented a report of the operations of the Institution since the last meeting of the General Synod. The report opens with an expression of gratitude to God for the signal deliverance of the Seminary from the dangers to which it was exposed during the memorable contest of Gettysburg, when its buildings and site constituted a part of the Battle-field. Reference is also made to the fact that a number of the Theological Students united with a company of volunteers, organized among the Students of Pennsylvania College in obedience to the call of the Governor of the State, and one of their number became the Captain of the company. The number of Students in attendance upon the instructions of the Professors the last session was twenty-three. The endowment fund is upwards of \$32,000. The announcement is made, that Dr. S. S. Schmucker, the Professor of Didactic Theology, who has presided over the Institution from the beginning, and has labored to promote its interests for thirty-eight years, has given the Constitutional notice of his intention to resign his position at the next meeting of the Board.

*The Liturgy.*

Rev. Dr. Schmucker from the Committee, appointed at the last Convention to prepare a Liturgy for the use of our churches, presented a report together with a printed copy of the work for distribution among the members. The report was received and the following minute on the subject adopted :

Whereas so important a measure as the adoption of a new Liturgy should not be taken until after the most careful and mature deliberation, therefore, *Resolved*, That the new Liturgy, prepared and printed by the Committee, be referred to the District Synods and churches for examination, and that

a Committee of five be appointed, to whom the action of the several Synods shall be referred, which Committee shall adjust and, as far as possible, endeavor to harmonize said action and report the same to the next General Synod. The Committee consists of S. S. Schmucker, D. D., H. N. Pohlman, D. D., J. G. Morris, D. D., S. Sprecher, D. D., and T. Stork, D. D.

*Pastors' Fund.*

The Trustees report that since the last Convention they had responded to all the applications made to them for relief; that several of the District Synods, in compliance with the request of the General Synod, had transmitted to the Treasurer their surplus funds, unappropriated, after the wants of their own superannuated ministers, widows and orphans had been supplied; and in conclusion earnestly urge upon the Church the duty of contributing liberally to the Fund so that it may be increased and rendered sufficient to meet any future demands. Two Trustees were elected to supply vacancies, so that the present Board consists of Rev. E. W. Hutter, L. L. Hout, Rev. G. F. Krotel, W. M. Heyl, Rev. L. E. Albert and W. W. Kurtz.

*Hymn Book.*

The Synod resolved in accordance with the recommendation, proposed in the Report of the Committee presented, by Rev. Dr. Jacobs, to whom was referred the report of the Hymn Book Committee, that the control and management of the Catechism, Hymn Book, Liturgy and other books of the General Synod, and the power to contract for the publication of the several editions should be entrusted to the Hymn Book Committee. This discretion is regarded as the more necessary at present as the extraordinary condition of our country materially affects the prices of publication. The Synod also resolved, in view of the fact that the income of Synod, from the sales of its publications, falls considerably below its actual and increasing expenses that collections be taken in the churches in the several District Synods for the purpose of creating a fund to defray the mileage of the delegates and other necessary expenses of Synod; and that any surplus funds, remaining hereafter in the Treasury be appropriated to the Missionary or Education Treasuries of the

General Synod. The time suggested for these collections in all the congregations of the General Synod is the first Sabbath (or near it) in April of each year. The Hymn Book Committee, selected by the Convention for the ensuing two years is composed of Martin Buehler, Dr. D. Luther, Dr. H. H. Muhlenberg, Hon. C. Kugler and Isaac Sulger, Esq.

*Proposed Changes in the Constitution of the General Synod*

*Resolved*, That the following propositions for the amendment of the Constitution of the General Synod, be sent down by the Secretary to the Presidents of the several District Synods in connexion with this body, with the request that they lay them before their respective Synods for decision.

I. Amendment to Art. 2d, in relation to the ratio of representation. Strike out the 2d paragraph of said article, and insert the following: "Each Evangelical Lutheran Synod containing eight ministers, may send one; if it contain sixteen, two; if twenty-four, three; if thirty-two, four; if forty, five; if fifty-five, six; if seventy, seven; if eighty-five, eight; and if it contain one hundred or upwards, nine delegates of the rank, of ordained ministers, and an equal number of lay delegates. Each Synod at present connected with this body, shall be entitled to, at least, one clerical and one lay representative."

II. Amendment to Art. 3, Sec. 3, in the relation to the admission of Synods. Strike out said Sec. 3. and insert the following: "All regularly constituted Lutheran Synods not now in connexion with the General Synod, receiving and holding with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the word of God as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word, may, at any time, become associated with the General Synod, by complying with the requisitions of this constitution, and sending delegates according to the ratio specified in Art. 2d."

*Resolutions in reference to alleged errors in the Augsburg Confession.*

*Whereas*, The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in the United States, has recognized the Augs.

burg Confession, both in the Constitution of the Theological Seminary and in the Constitution recommended to District Synods as well as in her Liturgy, and,

*Whereas*, Our churches have been agitated by the imputation of grave and dangerous errors in this Confession, so that amid conflicting statements many who are sincerely desirous of knowing the truth are distracted, knowing not what to believe, and the danger of internal conflict and schism, is greatly increased. And, whereas the General Synod, according to its Constitution, "shall apply all their powers, prayers and their means towards the prevention of schisms among us," we therefore, in Synod assembled, in the presence of the Searcher of hearts, desire to declare to our Churches and before the world, our judgment in regard to the imputation of these errors and the alienation among brethren which may arise from them.

*Resolved*, That while this Synod, resting on the word of God as the sole authority in matters of faith on its infallible warrant, rejects the Romish doctrine of the real presence or transubstantiation, and with it the doctrine of consubstantiation, rejects the Romish mass, and all the ceremonies distinctive of the mass; denies any power in the sacraments, as an *opus operatum*, or that the blessings of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, can be received without faith; rejects auricular confession and priestly absolution; holds that there is no priesthood on earth, but that of all believers, and that God only can forgive sins; and maintains the divine obligations of the Sabbath, and while we would with our whole heart reject any part of any Confession which taught doctrines in conflict with this, our testimony; nevertheless, before God and his Church, we declare, that in our judgment, the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is in perfect consistence with this our testimony and with the Holy Scriptures as regards the errors specified.

*Resolutions on Fraternal Union.*

*Whereas*, This General Synod, in order to set forth more fully its doctrinal basis, and with the view of checking the tendency to disintegration amongst us, and uniting us more firmly in fraternal union, has proposed to District Synods an amendment to its Constitution, and,

*Whereas*, We are anxiously desirous of giving the fullest

assurance to all our churches of our sincerity in this matter; therefore

*Resolved*, That this General Synod most unqualifiedly repudiates and condemns the course so frequently pursued, of denouncing each other as cold formalists on the one hand, and, on the other, as traitors to the Lutheran Church.

*Resolved*, That this Synod most earnestly recommends to the District Synods, and urges them all to call to account any of their members who may be guilty of denouncing their brethren on account of their differences of views on the non-essentials in the Augsburg Confession.

#### *Resolutions respecting Licentiates.*

*Resolved*, That the District Synods instruct their licentiates, in taking charge of churches, to attend to the regulation which requires permission from the President to do so in advance of any steps towards it.

*Resolved*, That the Synods abstain from receiving into the Ministry, either by licensure or ordination, applicants who have been under the care of other Synods.

*Resolved*, That the rejected of one Synod should not be received by another.

*Resolved*, That uniformity in the qualifications and mode of induction of applicants be recommended, and that, in order to meet the requisitions of the New Testament that hands be laid suddenly on no man, probation precede and not follow induction into the Ministry.

#### *Publication Society.*

The Synod, at this Convention, in accordance with a standing resolution, elected Rev. E. W. Hutter and Rev. A. C. Wedekind its representatives in the Board of Publication. The following paper was also adopted :

*Whereas*, the Publication Society is regarded by this Synod as engaged in a work, useful to the Church and promotive of the glory of God, therefore

*Resolved*. That this Synod cordially recommend this Society to the patronage and prayers of the Synods and churches in its connexion.

The Society held its usual business meeting and elected the following officers for the ensuing two years: *President*, Hon. C. Kugler; *Secretary*, Rev. P. Raby; *Board of Pub-*



lication, C. W. Schaeffer, D. D., W. J. Mann, D. D., B. Keller, E. W. Hutter, J. A. Seiss, D. D., L. E. Albert, M. Sheeleigh, C. P. Krauth, D. D., G. A. Wenzel, G. F. Krotel, J. H. Heck, S. Laird, C. J. Ehrehart, M. Valentine, C. A. Hay, D. D., S. S. Schmucker, D. D., J. G. Morris, D. D., C. F. Schaeffer, D. D., C. Kugler, G. Wagner, L. L. Hout, J. L. Frederick, M. Buchler and R. B. Miller.

### *Historical Society.*

The regular address, delivered according to appointment by Rev. Dr. Morris, was interesting and well received. The subject was the Authors and Literature of our Church in this country. Dr. Harkey was elected, as Principal and Dr. Harrison, as Alternate, to deliver the next biennial discourse. Drs. Morris, Passavant and Hay were appointed a Committee to visit the Library and make an inspection of its contents. The officers of the Society are Dr. Schmucker, *President*; Dr. Hay, *Corresponding Secretary*; Prof. Stoever, *Recording Secretary*; Dr. Jacobs, *Treasurer*; Dr. Schaeffer, *Curator*.

### *Church Extension Society.*

This Society with its venerable President, Charles A. Morris, in the chair, met and transacted its regular business.—The condition of the country has very much impaired this agency for good in the Church, yet the Committee do not doubt but when it shall have pleased God to suppress the Rebellion and restore peace to our land a new impetus will be given to the enterprise, and the Society with the Divine blessing will again accomplish much in building up the waste places of our Lutheran Zion. The officers elected are C. A. Morris, *President*; Rev. E. W. Hutter, *Corresponding Secretary*; G. W. Leisenring, *Recording Secretary*; W. M. Heyl, *Treasurer*; J. Monroe, M. Buchler, I. Sulger, Dr. C. M. Kreitzer, R. B. Miller, *Executive Committee*.

### *Parent Education Society*

held its meeting and transacted the usual business. At night the anniversary exercises were held, and an excellent discourse, delivered by Rev. G. A. Bowers, of Hillsboro' Illinois. The following individuals were chosen as the Board of Officers: *President*, S. W. Harkey, D. D.; *Corresponding*

*Secretary*, H. L. Baugher, D. D. ; *Recording Secretary*, G. Diehl, D. D. ; *Treasurer*, Prof. M. L. Stoecker ; *Executive Committee*, C. P. Krauth, D. D., S. S. Schmucker, D. D., M. Jacobs, D. D., Prof. F. A. Muhlenberg, C. F. Schaeffer, D. D., Rev. A. Essick and Rev. M. J. Alleman.

### *Foreign Missionary Society.*

From the Report of the Executive Committee we learn that our Missionary operations are in a flourishing condition. The prospects are cheering. Providence continues to smile upon our Mission in India. Rev. E. Unangst and wife, are laboring at Guntoor, Rev. A. Long and wife, at Samulcotta and Rev. C. W. Gronning and wife, at Rajamundry. The only officer in the Palnaud is Mr. Robert Cully, an East Indian, who superintends the Schools, and gives as much attention as he can to the spiritual interests of the people. Rev. Henry Heigard and Rev. J. Kistler are laboring successfully in connection with the African Mission. Rev. J. M. Rice has recently been commissioned for the same field and will soon enter upon his duties. Rev. Morris Officer retains the position of the Superintendent of the African Mission in connexion with the Financial Agency of the Society. The action of the Executive Committee, in not sending, for the present, a Missionary to China, in view of the unsettled state of our own country and the financial embarrassments that encompass us, was approved. They are however, instructed to prosecute the work of collecting funds for this object so as to found the Mission as soon as possible. Rev. R. Neumann has been regularly appointed as our Missionary to this field of labor. The Society elected as its officers for the ensuing two years C. W. Schaeffer, D. D., *President* ; Rev. J. Z. Senderling, *Corresponding Secretary* ; C. A. Hay, D. D., *Recording Secretary* ; M. Buehler, *Treasurer* ; H. N. Pohlman, D. D., J. L. Schock, D. D., Rev. A. Wetzel, Rev. W. N. Scholl and J. Z. Senderling, *Executive Committee*. At the anniversary exercises very effective addresses were delivered by Rev. F. W. Conrad, Rev. D. Garver and Rev. M. Officer.

### *Home Missionary Society.*

This Society held several meetings during the Convention of the General Synod and subjects of deep interest were presented for consideration. The Executive Committee

were requested to direct their attention to the thousands of colored persons whom the War and the Proclamation of the President of the United States have placed within the reach of the Mission efforts of the Christian churches of this country, and to adopt such measures as, in their judgment, will conduce to their spiritual improvement. The Committee were likewise instructed to appoint a Superintendent of Home Missions, so soon as funds, sufficient for the purpose shall have been received, whose duties shall be (1) to explore the Home Mission field and report to the Committee favorable localities for the establishment of Lutheran churches: (2) To ascertain by personal observation as far as practicable, the validity of the claims made by churches for appropriations from the Society: (3) To visit such portions of the Southern States as are now under our Government, and ascertain what can be done by our Church for the religious instruction of the freedmen, and suggest the best method for practical operation among the thousands of this hitherto degraded and neglected class in the country. At the anniversary services a very interesting address was delivered by Rev. A. R. Howbert, of Ohio, in reference to the freedmen of the South-West. The Board of Officers is composed of the following gentlemen: J. G. Morris, D. D., *President*; Rev. H. Bishop, *Corresponding Secretary*; C. A. Hay, D. D., *Rec. Secretary*; J. R. Drege, *Treasurer*; G. Diehl, D. D., T. Stork, D. D., J. G. Morris, D. D., G. H. Brandan, J. R. Drege, Joel Swartz, G. W. Leisenring, *Executive Committee*.

#### *Concluding Business.*

The Synod voted its grateful acknowledgements to the Lutheran Pastors and congregations of York, as well as to other Christian friends, for their kind hospitality; to the several Railroad companies for their generous consideration; and to the Officers of the Convention for their faithful and impartial services.

After engaging in singing and prayer by the President, the Synod adjourned to meet again on the third Thursday of May, 1866, in the city of Fort Wayne, Indiana.

## ARTICLE V.

QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE LORD'S PRAYER.—TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. FRANZ DELITZSCH.

By Rev. G. F. Krotel, A. M., Philadelphia.

I. *Is the name "Father," as applied to God, peculiar to the New Testament?*

The name Father, applied to God as the Creator, is common to both the Old and New Testament. (Job 38 : 7 ; Ephes. 4 : 6 ; Luke 3 : 38 ; ) In the Old Testament God is called Father in relation to his people, in so far as he made Israel a people, (Mal. 2 : 10,) his own people, (Deut. 32 : 6,) manifested his paternal love towards them, (Isa. 63 : 16 ; 64 : 8,) and demands of them filial reverence. (Mal. 1 : 6.) God also calls himself Father in relation to David and his seed. 2 Sam. 7 : 14 ; Ps. 89 : 26. His paternal relation to Christ, the son of David, is therefore already announced in the Old Testament ; and in Prov. 30 : 4, we also have an intimation that God, as such, has a Son. But the fuller revelation of the mystery of the holy Trinity ; the real purchase of the right of the adoption by the incarnate Son of God ; the actual extension of the term Israel, so as to apply to all believing Jews and Gentiles ; and the application of the paternal name to all, as well as the use of the name Father, as the usual mode in which believers are to address God—all these are advantages which the new dispensation has over the old.

II. *Is the Lord's prayer a specifically Christian prayer?*

This appears to be a strange question, and yet it deserves to be propounded. The Lord's prayer does not contain a single expression that is not used in the writings of the Old Testament, or in the ancient ecclesiastical language of the Jews, or of which it can be said that it originated with Jesus Christ. It contains no mention of the name of Jesus Christ, or of God as the Triune God ; and our Lord himself prior to his departure, remarked to his disciples : "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name." (John 16 : 24.) It does not, therefore, appear to be a specific prayer of the New Testament, and as far as the form in which it is ex-

pressed is concerned, it cannot be regarded as such. For the disciples received it from the Lord, while he was clothed in the humble form of a prophet of the kingdom of heaven; when as yet he had not entered as a high priest, into the most holy place, in virtue of the sacrifice of himself: nor as a king, had ascended the throne of the majesty on high. Only the death of the Redeemer is the end of the old covenant, and only the resurrection of the Redeemer is the dawn of the day of the New Testament. But when the incarnate Saviour has accomplished the work of redemption, and has returned to that glory which, as the Son of God, he had with the Father from all eternity, then the language of the Lord's prayer, equally appropriate to the revelation of the Old and New Testament, shines with the full light of the New Testament, and thenceforth the Lord's prayer is prayer in the name of Jesus, now revealed in all its depth; framed in that name with which God is well pleased, the name of the exalted God-man, who, as a high-priest, makes intercession for us, and as a king rules at the right hand of God, until all his enemies shall be made his footstool. When, therefore, we now pray the Lord's prayer, we gaze, through the same "Father," into the eternal depths of the Triune Godhead, and into that perennial fountain of love which flows forth from it to bless the fallen children of men; and the name of God, in the first petition, is none other than the Father's name which has been revealed in the Son; and the Kingdom of God, in the second petition is simply the kingdom of the God-man who sits at the right hand of power, and who shall come again in the clouds of heaven; and the will of God, in the third petition, is that will which we are moved to do by the Spirit which that glorified Saviour has poured out upon us. Whenever we pray the fourth petition, we encourage ourselves by thinking how the eternal Word became flesh, and that thereby our poor frail mortal life is sanctified. Reading the fifth petition, we daily wash our robes, and make them white in the blood of the Lamb; and when we come to the sixth, we hide ourselves in the wounds of him who bruised the serpent's head; of him who endured the bruising of his own heel, in order to bruise the serpent's head for us all; and when we repeat the seventh, our longings are fixed upon the glory in which he dwells:—"for whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. (Rom. 8 : 29.)



When we thus repeat the prayer, taught by Jesus the lowly, in the spirit of Jesus exalted and glorified, the Lord's prayer becomes a specific prayer of the New Testament. In order to be able to pray it in a truly Christian spirit, we must look upon the Father, with the eyes of the spirit, in his Son.

III. *Is the name Father addressed to the Triune God, or to the first person of the Godhead?*

The first trace of any reference of the name Father to the Triune God, is found in the ancient liturgy of the oriental Greek Church, and ascribed to Basilus and Chrysostom, in which the doxology appears in the following form: "For thine, the Father's, the Son's, and the Holy Ghost's, is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory." This application is also extensively adopted elsewhere, but erroneously. The prayer which Jesus Christ taught us, is addressed to Him, whom he intended to designate as often as he uttered the name of "Father" upon this earth; to that God who hath begotten the Son, and has sent him into the world; who, in him, is also our Father, and calls us to be his children. The Holy Scriptures nowhere call either God the Holy Spirit, or God the Son, "*Father*," neither in reference to the creation, nor the redemption; for in Isa. 9: 6, the Messiah is called so, because he is the king who is to bless his people for ever. The fact that the Son and the Holy Ghost do not share the name "*Father*" with God the Father, neither in relation to the creation nor the redemption, has its profound reason in this, that the paternal relation of God as Creator and as Redeemer to the world and mankind stands in the closest causative connection with his paternal relation to the eternal Son, through whom God the Father both created and redeemed the world.

IV. *Why does the introduction say: Our Father which art IN THE HEAVENS, and the third petition: in earth, as it IS IN HEAVEN?*

This difference is not expressed in Luther's version,\* but appears in the Vulgate, and in the most ancient German translations, beginning with the Gothic, which has *in himinam* in the introduction, and *sus in himina gah ana airthai* in the third petition. The use of the plural in one place, and of the singular in the other, is certainly not unintentional. In the

\*The same is true of the English version.—Trans.

introduction God the Father is described as being in the heavens, because He, exalted above the earth, fills the heavens, although the heaven of heavens cannot contain him.—(1 Kings, 8: 27.) But the expression in the third petition refers to the heaven of glory, where God's will is done by angels and the blest, and where God manifests himself in unveiled glory. Thus we read that Christ entered into heaven, namely into that of glory, into the holy place, Heb. 9: 24; 1 Pet. 3: 22, while at the same time, omnipresent also according to his glorified human nature, he has passed into the heavens, Heb. 4: 14, ascended up far above all the heavens, Eph. 4: 10, and is made higher than the heavens, Heb. 7: 26. (See Chr. Aug. *Crusius*, "Gedanken von dem Himmel." Leipz. 1757. 8.) "Heaven is that abode of the glory of God, beyond all the heavens, to which the angels referred, when they sang, Luke 2: 14, "Glory to God in the highest!"

5. *Do the words "our" and "us" merely include all true Christians, or all men?"*

The words *our* and *us* prohibit all selfishness on the part of the suppliant. He is but one voice in a chorus of thousands, in which no one is so isolate himself, but always to be mindful of his connection with all, and his obligations towards all. God's loving plan of redemption, however, is not intended for certain persons, to the exclusion of others, but for mankind. God offers himself as a father, in Christ his Son, to all men, without exception. Those who believe in Christ, have become the children of God; and those who do not yet believe in Christ, are designed to become so. Those only shall be lost who, by rejecting the Saviour, step out of the circle of love, which God's decree drew around the children of men. God excludes none but those who exclude themselves. In humble imitation of this pattern of all-embracing divine love, we pray "Our Father." In the *our* and *us* we therefore unite ourselves with all men; with those who have become God's children in Christ, and with those who are called to become God's children in Christ.

VI. *Which of the words of the fifth petition, "as we forgive our debtors," are emphatic?*

Nothing is more common, in praying the Lord's Prayer, than a false accentuation of these words. The accent is generally placed upon the words "forgive" and "debtors," and thus always makes the impression that the petitioner is repeating these words, which, according to the opinion of some

ancient writers, make the fifth petition the most dangerous of the seven,—without any thought whatever, or at least with wrong thoughts. But if, on the other hand, in accordance with the meaning of the words, he lays special stress upon the words “we” and “our,” this would always suggest the solemn question: “Are you actually treating your neighbor as you wish God to treat you? Are you forgiving, merciful, peaceable? Are you lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting?” (1 Tim. 2: 8.) The weighty importance of these words, over which many habitually glide so thoughtlessly, is evident from the fact that our Lord, after having taught us how to pray, in the Lord's Prayer, adds a further illustration of that part of the fifth petition, when he says: “For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.”

VII. *Is it more correct to say, in the seventh petition, “from the evil one,” or “from evil?”*

The Gothic version has *af thamma ubilin*: a Lord's Prayer of the 8th Century has *sona allum sunten*: one of the 12th Century, *von dem ubilem*, and in accordance with these Luther has rendered the expression, both in Matthew and Luke—“*von dem ubel*,” (from the evil, or from evil.) Many, on the other hand, prefer to render it: *from the evil one*, meaning not evil in the abstract, but Satan. The Greek admits of both translations. But the place occupied by the petition, at the close of the Lord's Prayer is in favor of Luther's translation.\* Deliverance in the most comprehensive sense of the word, for which we ask here, is more than deliverance from the devil. It is true that the devil, in so far as he is the author of sin, is also the cause of all evil; but after sin has entered into the world, there are also, in addition to the sufferings of which Satan is the instrument, immediate punishments and chastenings, which are the outflowings of the holy love of a righteous God; and when we repeat the seventh petition, we include all the various forms of evil and affliction peculiar to our present state and long to be released from this world, in which even God's paternal love scourgeth every son whom he receiveth, and to enter into that world, where God will wipe away all tears from the eyes of his children; where there shall be no more death.

\*And also of our English version. Trans.

neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away.

VIII. Were the words "*for thine is the kingdom,*" etc., originally a constituent part of the Lord's Prayer?

The so-called doxology, "*For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever,*" together with the "*Amen,*" is not an original constituent part of the Lord's Prayer, but a liturgical addition introduced by the ancient Church. This is evident already from the fact, that in Matt. 6, the fourteenth verse stands in immediate connection with the last petitions, and that the doxology really breaks the connection. In addition to this it is wanting in Luke 11 : 1-4; in several of the most important manuscripts; in many ancient versions of the Scriptures, especially the two ancient Latin ones; and was unknown to all the expositors among the fathers, prior to the time of Chrysostom. Tertullian, evidently ignorant of the existence of the doxology, calls the words, "but deliver us from evil," the conclusion (clausula) of the Lord's Prayer; and even Euthymius, in the beginning of the twelfth century, in controverting the position of the sect of the Messalians, who dropped the doxology, admits that it did not come from Christ, but is an addition supplied by the ancient lights and leaders of the Church. On this account it is also omitted in the two Catechisms of Luther. Nevertheless the doxology is as much in accordance with Scripture as it is appropriate. It clearly expresses the ground of our confident approach to our heavenly Father. The kingdom is his; and therefore it remains with him, to actualize the kingdom, which belongs to him. The power is his; he is able to actualize it, in spite of all the obstacles which sin in the world and in the individual opposes to him. The glory is his; he will bring it to a glorious consummation, so that it may stand forth as the brightness of his glory. The word of faith "*Amen,*" seals the prayer, even as that other word of faith "*Father*" opens it.

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE LITERATURE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.\*

By JOHN G. MORRIS, D. D., Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Johnson has said, that "The chief glory of a nation is its authors." The same is true of a Christian denomination. Missionary enterprize, ministerial fidelity, numerical strength, and enlarged liberality, are powerful auxiliaries and strong recommendations of a Christian people or Church. They secure wide-spread influence and a flattering reputation, but all these may endure only for one generation and their most prominent effects, after all, are confined to comparatively narrow limits. But great literary works survive for ages and they influence multitudes in all future time. It is not the ardent piety and amiable temper of Augustine, nor the heroic zeal and enduring patience of Origen, nor the fiery enthusiasm and undaunted boldness of Luther, that now move the hearts and enlighten the minds of men; it is their writings, and if they had written no books, all their pious energy would scarcely be noticed above that of thousands of others, who are forgotten or were never known, merely because they were not great authors. Rome boasted of mighty achievements in arts and arms, but Cicero and Virgil were the chief glory of the nation. The Capitol and Coliseum fell into ruin, and never will be rebuilt, but to this day her great authors are reproduced in hundred fold editions, and will be read by scholars in the remotest ages. Greece was great in architecture, commerce and conquest, but Demosthenes and Homer and her other great writers, alone survive. The magnificent structures of Athens and Corinth have fallen into decay, but her immortal authors are shining more resplendently with the lapse of ages and gaining increased power as the years roll on, and are rising higher and higher in the estimation of men.

\*Delivered by appointment of the Historical Society of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, at the meeting of the General Synod, at York, Pa., May 7th, 1864, and published by request.



Each nation, each community and each Christian denomination has its authors, estimated according to the cultivated taste and intellectual refinement of the people composing it. Some authors are distinguished every where and their works are prized by all readers; others, are distinguished in their own community and do not enjoy a universal reputation, but however extensive or limited their fame may be, if they are at all respectable, they are the chief glory of the people, whose opinions they reproduce or whose interests they maintain.

Every Church has its denominational literature; its own peculiar writers who defend its doctrinal position, or write its history, or prepare its books of devotion or morals suited to its own people and though the public in general may be and is profited, yet the fame of these writers is reflected on the Church to which they belong and the Church is proud that she has produced such men.

With these views, you may naturally presume that my theme is *The Literature of the Lutheran Church in the United States*. By the literature of our Church, I do not mean our libraries, and collections of valuable historical manuscripts, whether public or private, but our own literary productions; the writings of our own ministers and laymen; the books written and published by our own men and though we may not have accomplished as much as some other Churches of our country, yet, I am sure, the consideration of the subject will afford some interest and it is, at least, well suited to the present occasion.

There were many difficulties in the way of our ministers becoming authors in the early periods of our Church in this country. Though most of the men of that day were thoroughly educated at foreign Universities, yet here they had but little time to study or write; they were obliged to spend more time in the saddle than in the study; their mission fields were vast and laborious; beside this, our people were not generally extensive readers as but few primitive settlers any where can be; they could not afford to buy books even if books had been furnished, but above all, there was no great necessity for new books, for the ministers brought libraries with them from Europe and the people had their Bibles and Arndt's *Waches Christenthum* and other religious books. These reasons have some force even to this day and our transition state is not favorable to the cultiva-

tion or encouragement of the highest style of literary production, but still, we have done something and it will be my aim to state what has been accomplished.

The influence which the cultivation of learning and the production of good books, have upon a denomination is manifestly great and varied. They inspire the respect and confidence of our own people. They are proud of having eminent preachers and learned professors and cultivated ministers, but still prouder of having popular and appreciated authors, whose writings they may read and who are respected as such by other denominations. Good books induce many persons to read, for many a man will, at first read the productions of his own Church, who is indifferent about those of another and thus he will acquire the good habit. These pursuits and results also, inspire the respect of other Churches; they do not ask what great preachers we have, but what respectable authors and just in proportion that we can show them sound literary productions, is their respect for us increased. Yes, it is true, the chief glory of a Church is its authors.

In the second volume of the *Lutheran Intelligencer*, in 1828, I published the first list of Lutheran writers in America that was ever made. It contained only the chief productions, but still the number was few. In 1840, a list of our American authors was appended by Professor Schmucker to his "Portraiture of Lutheranism." The number had increased considerably between 1828 and 1840, but still the Professor's list did not embrace all the publications. A third list was published by Professor Stoecker in the *Evangelical Quarterly Review* for October, 1854 and a fourth by the same gentleman in April, 1861. This last list contains over five hundred and twenty-eight titles and the next one to be published before long, will have above six hundred.

We all know and highly value this gentleman as an untiring and successful gatherer of Lutheran Statistics and an eminent Lutheran Biographer. The man who devotes his time to gathering historical facts concerning the Church and rescuing from oblivion many names of precious memory, to restoring broken monuments and dilapidated tomb-stones and freshening up with his skillful chisel the nearly effaced inscriptions, as that gentleman is doing, deserves the everlasting gratitude of the Church, and will receive it. But for his indefatigable industry and unwearyed patience, many an interesting and important fact would have been lost for ever

and many a name fragrant with apostolic piety, would have perished from the memory of men.

The number of our men who are authors of distinct publications whether books or pamphlets, is one hundred and ninety-one, of whom nine are laymen, who themselves have produced twenty-three publications. The number of our ministers including all the Synods is at present, nearly fourteen hundred so that the proportion of writers to the whole is a little over one seventh. In this enumeration, I, of course, do not include Magazine or Review Articles, and much less newspaper writers, for these are not distinct publications, but in a history like that which I am trying to present, they must not be overlooked. They constitute an influential department of our literature, though they do not appear as books or pamphlets. I will then state, that the number of Lutheran contributors to the *Evangelical Review* since its beginning in 1849, amounts to sixty-nine, and only twenty-two of these have not published distinct books or pamphlets.

It would be too laborious and perhaps impossible to ascertain the number of articles furnished by our ministers to the various Monthly Journals that have appeared in our Church and utterly out of the question to ascertain the authors of the thousand articles in our religious papers. But there are several other publications of a more substantial character than the Monthly Magazine or Weekly Paper, which are properly mentioned here; one is, the "Lutheran Preacher," conducted by the lamented Eichelberger. To this twenty-two of our ministers contributed Sermons, six of whom never published any thing else; and the other is the "Lutheran Pulpit," conducted by Rev. C. A. Smith, for which seven-teen of our ministers furnished Sermons, three of whom never published any thing else.

There is another interesting question connected with this branch of our subject and that is, how many of our ministers have contributed to the Reviews and kindred publications of other denominations? As far as I have been able to ascertain only nine,\* and the publications for which they have written are the "Bibliotheca Sacra" the "Congregational Quarterly," the "Mercersburg Review," the

\*Rev. Drs. Krauth, Sen., S. S. Schmucker, Reynolds, Hay, C. F. Schaeffer, Prof. Stoever, Rev. F. M. Bird, Prof. Jacobs, and Rev. Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr.

"United States Service Magazine," and Appleton's Encyclopedia. I said that the number of publications was five hundred and twenty-eight: of this number, one hundred and fifty-five are books properly called and the remainder are pamphlets. The number of books on theology in its widest sense is one hundred and thirty-seven, the specific subjects of which embrace a wide range. The remainder are on science, history and education. The pamphlets are for the most part, sermons. The others treat the subjects of literature, science, temperance and education.

We never had amongst us a poet of reputation. The only volume of poems ever produced by us are two in the German language, one by an obscure German minister in a Western State, and that was a posthumous publication, and the other by a member of the Missouri Synod. These display very considerable talent but the poetic element does not seem to prevail among our clergy or if it does, it has never been cultivated and the literary world has not enjoyed the benefit of it. Even our translations of German hymns have not been successful. Gentlemen of other denominations have rendered better service in this field than any of ours.

The list of publications, I have spoken of, is creditable to our ministry. It shows that amid pressing pastoral labors, nearly or quite two hundred of them have had time to write something, and courage to trust themselves to the press. I will not say, that we have all done wisely and no doubt, some have wished that they had waited a little while longer and pondered their thoughts more maturely before committing them to print. But in this country, many things are done unadvisedly and many a man is in a hurry to publish crude and undigested stuff, which exposes him to severe and well merited criticism and occasions grief to himself and his friends. This is true, particularly of many of the communications in our weekly press.

But it is not only the book makers and the pamphleteers who deserve honorable notice. The Review writers are equally and perhaps more entitled to favorable mention than the writers of fugitive pamphlets. No man with a decent sense of propriety will commit himself to a Review, who has not thoroughly investigated his subject. He knows that few except the most intelligent and best educated of our clergy and people read Reviews, and that his article will undergo the keen scrutiny of competent critics. He therefore, lays out all his strength on his article and it costs him more labor



than a mere popular sermon, and hence he deserves the most credit. Yet book making, pamphleteering and Review writing, are not to be considered the only tests of scholarship. There are not a few men who have never been inconsiderate enough to write a book, publish a pamphlet or contribute to a Review, who are known to be better general scholars and more learned theologians, than many who have inflicted their writings on an indulgent public. Cases of this character, will occur to every intelligent mind.

It will perhaps surprise some to hear, that of the five hundred and twenty-eight publications, only one hundred and five are in the German language, and very few of these are more than occasional sermons and controversial tracts. There are a few devotional volumes and some illustrations of Luther's Catechism. But this fact need surprise no one. Our German churches were better supplied with a church literature than the English churches, neither were they, in general, readers of other books than two of the best ever published, viz. the Bible and Arndt's *Wahres Christenthum*; neither had most of our German ministers encouragement or time to write.

There is one fact which, in this connexion, is worth mentioning. There is no church in this country, in which the Gospel is preached in as many languages as in our own. We have German, English, Swedish, Norwegian, Bohemian in several dialects, and have had French and Low Dutch, so that seven languages have been employed by our ministers in proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation. Whilst we have periodicals published in other languages besides the German and English, no book has been published by us in any other language in this country, except Luther's Catechism and a Hymn Book in one of the Scandinavian tongues.

The Synod of Maryland has had more authors and has contributed more publications to this list, than any other Synod in the Church. She has furnished twenty-four writers and one hundred and sixteen titles. The Synod of Pennsylvania has had nineteen writers and sixty titles. The Synod of West Pennsylvania has had eleven writers and sixty-nine titles. No other Synod has so large a number and it is not necessary to be more specific.

These publications have been received with varied success and approbation. Many of them, such as sermons particularly, were designed for private circulation and are not ex-



tensively known. Some of the more ambitious productions have had a wider circulation and have been several times republished.

A few of our writers have been handsomely compensated for their labor, yet few books pay. Not over one in a hundred ever pays expenses and if any money is made at all out of the ninety-nine, the publisher gets it all and the poor author is left dry. Authorship is a very poor business and yet not a few are ambitious to invest presumed or real talent in it, and some are not a little vexed when Committees on Publications and professional book publishers do not accept their manuscripts and put them in print at their own expense and risk.

Nothing is more certain and encouraging too, than that our people are fast improving. They buy and read more books now than ever before and every really good book furnished by our ministers, is purchased by many. This is an age of active book making and book reading. There are fashionable religious books as well as fashionable novels and in some cases, it is hard to tell, which of the two has most religion in them.

Is it likely that those books already published by us, will acquire a lasting reputation and continue to be reproduced in successive editions? Very few, indeed most of them have served their generation and have gone down quietly to the tomb after a brief existence. Nobody deplores them but the author, for other people have no time or inclination, in this fast age, to think of the past. Many books are born dead and few survive long. True, a book may have a sort of protracted life of spasms by being hawked through the country every year by persevering colporteurs and thrust upon an unwilling community by unscrupulous book agents, and thus thousands may be sold but this is no real test of the value of a book and a book that requires this constant application of a galvanic apparatus to keep life in it, is not healthy. The true test of the goodness of a book is, when it is eagerly sought for by intelligent readers for its own sake and bought without the pressing and often impudent solicitations of interested hawkers.

Only three of our Church productions have ever been republished abroad and they are Dr. Schmucker's book on "Christian Union," which appeared in London in 1845. His Translation of "Storr and Platt's Biblical Theology," in London, and Dr. C. P. Krauth's Translation of

"Tholuck's John," in Edinburgh. Rev. Dr. Krauth's, Sermon before the General Synod in Charleston was translated and published in "Rudelbach and Guericke's Zeitschrift." This is a well deserved compliment and shows the high appreciation of them by foreign Christians.

Not a few of our clergy have received titular dignities. We have about forty who flourish the title of D. D. and surely if these honors are any real test of theological scholarship, we have made wonderful advancement. But a D. D. at the present day, is not expected to be a learned man. The question with those sagacious College Trustees who confer these cheap degrees, is not always, how many books has the candidate read or written, what attainments in theological science has he made, what learned articles has he contributed to the Reviews, what great books of other times has he edited with improvements, but how many students can he secure for the College? How many votes can he influence for a certain measure? How many particular friends has he among the Trustees? It is not so in all cases; there are some exceptions, but we are Americans and a very fast people.

None of our men, as far as I know, have received theological honors from abroad. Foreign Universities are not quite so lavish of College dignities as we and they, simple people, think that a man should be learned before he is called so, and that a man should be a divine before he is styled a Doctor of Divinity. Whilst no theological honors have been bestowed upon us from Europe, I know two of our men who have received diplomas from Scientific Societies of high distinction, and one of these has been, twice thus honored. A few of our men have been elected honorary members of distinguished Scientific, Philosophical and Literary Associations in our own country but there is only one, who has had the honor of membership in that most learned and exclusive of all our American Societies, the Oriental.

There is one class of Literature that has been successfully cultivated among us, and that is translation and mostly from the German. This is supposed by some to be an inferior department of Literature, requiring no research and very little preparatory knowledge. It is true to some extent and yet not every man who understands two languages, is necessarily a good translator. It requires taste, tact, judgment and a copiousness of language to do it well, and all good scholars do not possess these qualifications.

I have heard more than one of our ministers regret, that we have left so many good Lutheran books to be translated by men of other denominations. Nearly all the theological books translated in this country have been Lutheran and some of our ministers affirm that we should be ashamed not to have done this work ourselves, for it is our literature and we should have secured the credit of furnishing it to the English reading community. I am not of that opinion, for in the first place, few of our men have the requisite time to devote to literary pursuits, for I boldly affirm, that no clergymen of any Church are more laborious in the discharge of pastoral duties, and few, if any, have as much pastoral work to do, as ours. Instead of being ashamed that our ministers have not rendered more service of this character, I hold that we should congratulate ourselves that our English reading community so highly appreciate the German productions of our Church as to spend so much time and labor in translating them. Credit is reflected on the Church which furnishes such writers and that Church are we.

But our periodical literature demands attention and in this department we have succeeded well. The first Lutheran Magazine ever published in this country was, *Das Evangelische Magazin*, commenced in Philadelphia, in 1811 and was edited by Drs. Helmuth, Schmidt and others. It was published at intervals in Svo. form and was discontinued in 1814. From that period until 1826, the church was destitute of a religious journal. In March 1826, the first number of the "Lutheran Intelligencer" was issued in Fredericktown, Md., under the editorship of Drs. Schaeffer and Krauth, the latter of whom at that time resided in Martinsburg, Va. It was a monthly publication, Svo. size, and each number contained about 26 pp. It was the first English Lutheran periodical published in this country. It originated in what was then known as the Synod of Maryland and Virginia, and was published at its expense. Its duration of life was five years. In February, 1831, the last number was issued, when it had less than five hundred subscribers and was \$800 in debt. After a vigorous attempt to collect the dues, there still remained a balance of \$500 against it, which the Synod of Maryland was compelled to pay. The Intelligencer, though not highly valued in the last several years of its existence, performed good service, even if it did no more than prepare the way for other more popular journals. A sturdy pioneer in a good work always deserves respect. The chief editor

was an active and laborious pastor of a large parish, and received no compensation for his editorial work.

The next periodical in the order of time, was the "Lutheran Magazine," published in monthly numbers at Schoharie, New York, and edited by an association of clergymen, but chiefly by the Rev. Dr. Lintner. The first number appeared in February, 1827, just eleven months after the birth of the *Intelligencer*. At the termination of the third volume, it was transferred to the Directors of the Domestic Missionary Society but it was not continued.

The next which appeared was "Das Evangelische Magazin," published in monthly numbers in German and was edited at first by Rev. J. Herbst, but subsequently by Drs. Hazelius and S. S. Schmucker. Its first number was issued in Sept. 1829, and its last in April, 1833.

The "Lutheran *Intelligencer*" and the "Lutheran Magazine" having been discontinued, there was no English paper published in the church from January, 1830 to August, 1831. On that day No. 1, of the *Lutheran Observer* was sent forth. It was "a little one," a modest, unpretending monthly 8vo. of 30 pp. but it has grown to be a power in the Church. It has had more friends and, I may say, more enemies too than any paper ever printed in the Church, and has exercised a commanding influence for over thirty years. It was begun in Baltimore, where it has ever since remained and was first edited by a very young man, who had no subscribers, no capital, and no experience. He was injudicious enough to assume the responsibility, at the earnest solicitation of some influential men of that day, and the implied understanding was, that the Church was to receive the profits, and he himself to pay the losses! He has the satisfaction of having heard more than one man of judgment declare that the earlier volumes of the "*Observer*" are to this day very interesting and readable documents. But every man likes to hear his first born well spoken of, especially where there is good ground of admiration. The prospectus of the *Observer* was issued at Gettysburg, where it was intended to be published, but before No. 1, appeared, it was transferred to Baltimore, and the aforesaid ministerial stripling was induced to undertake it. The 2nd volume of the *Observer* was issued in 4vo. form, and continued thus for one year, when the editorship was conveyed to Rev. B. Kurtz, in 1833. It may just do well here to say, that the first editor never retained a cent for his services, but gave the profits to the poor. Mr. Kurtz re-



moved to Baltimore in August, 1833, and entered upon his duties with energy. The *Observer* was then converted into a weekly, 4vo. sheet, and continued to be published in this form for six months. In April, 1834 it appeared in an enlarged form, of usual newspaper size. For twenty-five years Dr. Kurtz conducted the paper with varying success, and since his retirement, its history is too recent to be written.

In 1848, the "Missionary" was started by Mr. Passavant in Pittsburg, which has been merged into the "Lutheran and Missionary," now published in Philadelphia. The "Lutheran Standard" was begun in New Philadelphia, O., in 1842 and is still continued, though published at the present, at Delaware, Ohio. The "Evangelical Lutheran" first appeared in Springfield, Ohio, in 1853, and was discontinued after a few years.

During this period other journals, edited by Lutheran gentlemen appeared, but have ceased to exist, such as the "Frederick Visitor," the "Olive Branch" of Illinois, the "Linnean Journal and Record," the "Lutheran Pulpit," the "Lutheran Preacher," the "Monthly Magazine of Religion and Literature," the "Lutheran Home Journal," the "Eclectic Magazine." The "Sunday School Herald," published at Philadelphia, commenced in 1860, and is still vigorously conducted and extensively patronized.

In July, 1819, appeared No. 1 of the *Evangelical Review*, and has ever since maintained a high standard for excellence. This is the *Luna inter minora sidera*. The German papers have increased in larger proportion than the English, though their circulation is not so extensive. I should be pleased to give the history, as far as practicable of every periodical ever published in our Church, but the detail would be dry and must be reserved for another occasion and in a form different from a public Address.

Our periodical literature presents some striking and encouraging facts. Some of us remember when we had but one English paper and one German, and now there are twenty-one Journals especially devoted to the interests of our Church; five English, eleven German, two Swedish and three Norwegian. What is especially worthy of mention, is that these Scandinavians who are recent emigrants comparatively and not one tenth as numerous as the Germans, support nearly half as many religious papers. They have five, and the Germans only eleven. They have been less than



twenty years in the country, and the Germans have been here over one hundred years. These North Europeans have energy and should be cherished by the Church in America.

The earliest Lutheran book written in America, though not printed here, is a translation of Luther's Catechism in the language of the Delaware Indians, printed in Stockholm, in 1696-8, and the next is the Journal of the Proceedings of the Salzburg emigrants, who formed the settlement of Ebenezer in Georgia. It is entitled *Ausführliche Nachrichten von den Salzburgerischen Emigranten die sich in America niederlassen haben* herausg. von Samuel Urlsperger, Halle, 1734. 4th. This Journal was continued from year to year until 1752, forming eighteen parts. Another was commenced in 1754 which is entitled *Amerikanisches Ackerwerk Gottes, oder Zuverlässige Nachrichten den Zustand des Americanish-Englischen und von Salzburgerischen Emigranten erbauten Pflanzstadt Ebenezer in Georgien betreffend*, &c., Augsburg 1754. 4th. The second volume was published in 1755, the third in 1756, with a supplement in 1769 and a fourth in 1767. These Salzburgers appear to have been as industrious with their pens as with their ploughs; the printed books relating to their little colony, would form a small library. There are a few of these volumes in the Seminary library at Gettysburg. The *Hallsche Nachrichten* begun in 1744 by the Patriarch Muhlenberg and his associates, are of the same character of publications and belong to our Lutheran Literature.

Will the literature we have already achieved, be permanent? Alas! few books survive a year, however popular they may be at first. There are so many books issued at the present day, that one soon pushes the other into a neglected corner where it is soon forgotten and covered with dust. We know how eagerly the writings of some of our men were sought when first published and how many copies were sold, which are now entirely forgotten or seldom asked for. This is the fate of most books, though there are a few rare exceptions. Let the ambitious young man who aspires to authorship prepare himself for grievous disappointment, unless he produces a work of genius and power.

It is gratifying to observe an improvement in that indispensable auxiliary to decent scholarship, the private library. Few of our men can afford to purchase first class libraries but many of our reading men are buying good books, and

what is gratifying above all is, that these books include the higher and older style of German theology. During the last five years, there have been more copies of the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church sold to ministers than during the preceding twenty years.

I happen to know that several of our ministers are laboriously at work on writing books, a few of which may appear within a year or two, but these times are not favorable to the book trade, excepting of a particular character.

This rapid sketch of our literature will show us what has been done, and will encourage us to greater efforts hereafter.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

#### LIX.

#### CHARLES RUDOLPH DEMME, D. D.

It is with mingled feelings of sorrow and affliction, that we sit down to prepare a sketch of this great and good man, so long and so favorably known all over the country, one of the brightest ornaments of the Lutheran Church, a prince and a great man in Israel. Some of our earliest recollections are associated with this noble-hearted man and Christian minister. In later years our intercourse with him was frequent, pleasant and cordial; our respect and reverence increased with every successive year, and we remember with affectionate interest the lessons of wisdom we gathered from his lips. His virtues are enshrined in many hearts; his name should be added to the list of those worthy of remembrance; his memory will be cherished by the Church with gratitude and love.

Charles Rudolph Demme was born April 10th, 1795. He died Sept. 1st, 1863. He was, therefore, at the time of his death in the 69th year of his age. He was born at Mühlhausen, Thuringia. His parents were Frederica König, and Rev. Dr. Hermann Gottfried Demme, who occupied honora-

ble and prominent positions in his native country, as Superintendent of Mühlhausen and subsequently as General Superintendent at Altenburg. Under the influence of their pious instructions, the son was trained, and the foundation of his religious character laid. His earlier studies he pursued at the Gymnasium at Altenburg, from which he was transferred to the University of Göttingen, and afterwards to that of Halle. He was a student at the University, at the time there was so great an uprising of the young Germans for the purpose of repelling the invasion of Napoleon, and volunteered his services. With his companions in study he immediately repaired to the scene of conflict. Enthusiastic in everything he undertook, his zeal led him into imminent danger and the front of the battle. At Waterloo, where Blücher's cavalry did such terrible execution, young Demme was carried wounded and bleeding from the field. The scar across one cheek and part of the nose and which was so readily noticed he received on this occasion. This incident, although he never spoke of it, had no doubt an important influence upon his whole future life, in his decision to make the United States, his permanent home, and the selection of the ministry of reconciliation, his regular profession. Originally he was designed for the Law, but his services were needed in another direction. God often accomplishes his purposes in a mysterious way, and leads his children by paths of which they knew not, at the time.

Mr. Demme came to this country in 1818, a young man twenty-three years of age, deeply imbued with a love of liberty and an ardent admirer of American institutions. He was the following year licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania. His first charge was Hummelstown, Dauphin county, Pa. The relation between him and his people was happy and prosperous. He often in after life referred to this period with interest and satisfaction. In 1822 he received and accepted a call to St. Michael's and Zion's Church, as colleague of Rev. Dr. F. D. Schaeffer,\* a larger and more responsible field of labor than the one previously occupied. Here he continued to labor with great fidelity and success for thirty-seven years, showing the Church what spirit he possessed and illustrating the principles which he held, till his health began to fail him. So con-

\**Vide Evangelical Review*, Vol. VIII. p. 200.

stant and heavy were the drafts that were made upon him, that his physical constitution, naturally vigorous, gradually yielded. It was supposed that a suspension of his labors for a season, and a foreign trip would resuscitate his system. The Church granted him a furlough and made the necessary arrangements for his absence. He returned home highly gratified with his visit to his native land, and with apparently improved health. But there was no permanent change; a decline speedily followed and, for several years before his death, he was unable to perform any active duties in the ministry. In 1859, he was chosen *Pastor Emeritus*, which position he held till he was called to a higher sphere in another world. His health became more and more affected, his mind clouded and enfeebled; his brain had been overtasked, his powers were prematurely exhausted by excessive labor, the wonderful instrument, through which the immortal spirit had manifested its presence, was jarred and broken. He was obliged to withdraw from the field and seek repose. His work on earth was done. Sad and distressing was the feeling, produced throughout the Church, as the tidings spread, that this bright luminary was extinguished. Painful was it to all, who visited him, to perceive that the mighty intellect had lost its power. Yet even during that long, dark night of mental gloom how his faithful heart still clung to his favorite work, how he sighed and wept, that he could not resume his wonted duties, and how he continued, until the last, to give evidence of his deep interest in Zion, and of the strength of his Christian faith. All felt, that when the final summons came, he at once rejoiced in the light of God's immediate presence, through the merits of that Saviour whom he so cordially trusted, so faithfully served and so earnestly preached.

The obsequies of Dr. Demme were of the most touching and solemn character. The occasion was connected with every symbol of respect and sorrow; nothing was omitted which either good taste or kind feeling could suggest to add to its impressiveness. Several hours before the public services, the body was removed from the residence of the deceased to the Church, which was hung with heavy folds of mourning drapery; the bier was placed in front of the altar, and multitudes crowded the edifice to gaze for the last time, upon the well-known features of him, whom they so much loved and whose words, which he had spoken to them, they yet remembered, as he lay before them in his clerical robes.

still looking as natural as life. The preliminary exercises were held at the house, which was filled by the immediate friends, his brethren in the ministry and representatives from various Institutions, with which he had been identified. — Prayers were offered by Rev. Messrs. B. W. Schmuck and B. M. Schmucker, and a most appropriate and beautiful address was delivered by Rev. G. F. Kretel, who had been reared under his ministry and prepared through his instructions for the sacred office, from the words, "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel." When the procession reached the Church, it seemed filled to its utmost capacity, and the many who could not enter the building thronged the side-walks. The Lutheran ministry was largely represented; the clergymen of the city, his own congregation and others, by whom he was known and esteemed were there to testify their regard. — The deepest interest was manifested in the services. The dirge, the plaintive music, as well as every other arrangement, was admirably adapted to the occasion. The devotions in the sanctuary were conducted by Rev. Messrs. H. G. Mennig and J. Vogelbach, and a touching and eloquent discourse was pronounced by Rev. W. J. Mann, D. D., from the text, "By it he being dead yet speaketh." At the conclusion of the exercises in the Church, a long train of carriages followed the hearse to the cemetery at Laurel Hill, where a brief and appropriate sketch of the life and character of the deceased was read, and the solemn burial services performed by Rev. G. A. Wenzel, long his devoted and cherished friend. Then the coffin was lowered, the last words were uttered and the grave enclosed in its embrace the mortal remains of Charles Rudolph Demme. The spirit was already sheltered in the bosom of its God among the redeemed in the blessed mansions prepared for those who have come out of great tribulation whose robes are washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb.

Dr. Demme was married on the 7th of October, 1828, to Mariana, only daughter of Rev. Dr. Frederick D. Schaeffer, with whom for forty years, he was happily united. He was the father of eleven children, five sons and six daughters. — Four of them preceded him into the eternal world. His widow with five children still live, to lament the loss they have sustained. The youngest son, a man of fine abilities excel-



lent principles and ardent patriotism, recently fell in the service of his country, on the field of battle, in the 22nd year of his age.

Dr. Demme was no ordinary character. This is acknowledged by all who were brought in contact with him. That he was not more generally known is to be ascribed to the fact, that his official labors were confined to the German language. He would have shone in any department, or profession, to which he would have devoted his attention. He was endowed with an original vigorous intellect, a clear head and sound judgment, an active, inquiring reflecting mind, which was always prompt and sure in reaching results. He was an independent thinker, with great energy of will, a man of commanding talent and marked ability.

He also brought with him to this country a thorough and complete education, such as his native land alone could have afforded, which had fully developed all his mental powers, and given them an impulse, felt through life. His father, himself highly educated, had furnished him with the best facilities for intellectual improvement. Trained in the best schools of Germany, he knew how to study, and had learned to investigate every subject claiming his attention, carefully and thoroughly. He was a man of enlarged culture and extensive learning, an accurate and accomplished scholar. He was a fine linguist, not only in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, but in French and other modern European languages. He often regretted, whilst actively engaged in the work of the ministry that he could not devote more time to the prosecution of his favorite studies, the ancient classics. He was a profound theologian, an able dialectician and a diligent student, continually adding to his stores, and these acquisitions he was always ready to impart to others. Says one,\* who knew him intimately and appreciated his worth, "If I were to say, in the sphere of Theology, taking it in its widest sense, his instructions were to me more profitable than those of any other, or all men I have known, it would be the simple truth." His talents and great learning were recognized and generally appreciated. He could have occupied with distinction any position in the Church. In 1839 he was called to the Professorship of Theology in the Seminary at Columbus, Ohio, and in 1849 was elected Professor in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, at Gettysburg, Pa., but both positions he felt it his duty to decline. He was a member of the American Philosophical

\*Prof. C. P. Krauth, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

Society and was honored with the Doctorate of Divinity, from the University of Pennsylvania in 1832.

As a pulpit orator, Dr. Demme excelled greatly. Here he attained a pre-eminence which was not surpassed by any of his cotemporaries, and seldom equalled in any age. He was a prince among preachers, earnest, fervid, and effective, rich in thought, logical in method, forcible in diction, evangelical in sentiment, often carrying his hearers with him on a tide of irresistible eloquence. His delivery was not merely a quiet rehearsal of the discourse, but it was accompanied with the greatest action. He possessed every attribute, that constitutes a great preacher. This was universally admitted. On this point we might multiply testimony to an indefinite extent. Says one,\* a most competent judge, "I knew no pulpit orator who can be compared to him. Whenever my own Church is closed, I go to hear Dr. Demme, and am always amply repaid." Writes another,† "In every thing requisite to preaching of a very high order he was distinguished—he had no superior, he had no equal. His preaching was based on a thorough study of the text; it was logical; it combined force of language with beauty of illustration, it was heart-utterance and in its delivery intensely earnest, and often highly impassioned. With a majestic voice he uttered the truths of the Gospel with deep pathos and thrilling power. Nothing far-fetched or tawdry, nothing bombastic or inflated, nothing mystical or obscure, nothing revolting or tasteless appeared in his pulpit performances.—He regarded himself as bound to do on every occasion, in which he was called to officiate, the best. He slighted no preparation. He made himself thoroughly acquainted with every subject he undertook to handle." Says one,‡ who for many years sat under his ministry, "He lives in the deep, lasting and eternal impressions made by his transcendently eloquent preaching of the Word of God. His eloquence lives, and shall live as a memory in the Church. His words were words of power.—Few have known how to wield the sword of the Spirit as he wielded it. And the earnest, solemn, searching power of his words were strengthened and confirmed by all his walk and conversation. To him most emphatically life was real and earnest. There was no time for trifling. His look, his voice, his sentiments proclaimed this."

\*P. F. Mayer, D. D., Philadelphia. †C. P. Krauth, D. D., Gettysburg.  
‡G. F. Kretel, D. D., Philadelphia.

Rev. Dr. James W. Alexander, of the Presbyterian Church in his familiar correspondence with Rev. Dr. Hall, speaks of him in the following language: "Dr. Demme has sent me a copy of his sermon, preached before Synod in 1860. It is really an excellent, and even eloquent production. We have few men among us who can preach so effectively a discourse in English. It is faithful and warm, and has some original turns of Scripture quotation. I cannot say how well the production may look in our version, especially by the author himself, as his German style is very easy and idiomatic." Illustrating in his life the power and blessedness of the Gospel he brought to the service piety and learning, and made the ministry of the word the grand aim of his life, with which no other object was allowed to interfere. He was most careful and diligent in his preparation for the pulpit, usually commencing his efforts for the Lord's Day early in the week, and prosecuting them, as time permitted, gathering together the results of his reading and reflections, and reducing his ideas to writing. He never, however, wrote out his sermons in full. His plan was first thoroughly to investigate the text and then develop the leading theme, taking the prominent thoughts lying in the text or theme, as his divisions and subdivisions. These were committed to paper and the thoughts, which occurred to his mind, written under each head, blank spaces being left for additional thoughts. All was then subjected to a deep, intense, mental process, and the train of ideas distinctly fixed in the mind. After the discourse had been delivered, the manuscript was immediately taken up, new thoughts, that suggested themselves either immediately before, or during the delivery, were introduced into the blank spaces, the whole was once more rigidly reviewed, and then the manuscript laid aside.\* Among German pulpit orators he most

\*The following outlines of some of Dr. Demme's discourses, as specimens of his method and arrangement, may be of some interest to the reader:

*Good Friday.* Text, John XIX. 18, "Where they crucified him, and two others with him, on either side one, and Jesus in the midst." *Introduction*—(A death-scene always affecting—to-day one inexpressibly sad.) *Theme*.—With what sentiments and resolutions should a Christian congregation survey the Saviour on the cross? I. The sentiments, &c., as they stand and look. a] The most profound grief (description of the pangs of crucifixion.) b] The deepest horror (the atrocious conduct of the Jews whom he came to save.) c] The most sincere reverence (God speaks! the sun darkened—earthquake—veil rent—his words on the

of all admired Reinhard, and was disposed to take him as his model. He fully understood his method and appreciated his powers. Among the French, Bourdaloue's powerful style of reasoning pleased him, even more than the various excellencies of Bossuet and Massillon. Among the British he pre-

cross, d] The most joyful emotions (for as he suffers—dies, he conquers!) II. The resolutions, &c., on leaving the spot. a] to confess him boldly (how loudly those pierced hands—that bleeding head appeals—could you turn away with an unfeeling heart? b] To accept the grace of God in Christ, with gratitude. c] to renounce the service of sin forever. d] To walk in love, as he walked (appeal to those living in enmity—)

*Easter Sunday.*—Mark 16: 1-8. "And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun; And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away, for it was very great. And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted. And he said unto them, Be not affrighted: ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him. But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed; neither said they any thing to any man for they were afraid." Introduction. (Allusions to Good Friday, and character of the event commemorated to-day—what light flows in upon us, when the risen Saviour approaches.) *Theme.*—Illustrations of our future state, furnished by the resurrection of Jesus. I. The lessons which it teaches, &c. a] That, after death, the soul enters the invisible world, (Jesus—his "spirit into his Father's hands," Luke 23: 46—in Paradise—with malefactor—preached to spirits in prison.) b] The soul retains its consciousness (Jesus, after resurrection spoke to his disciples—mentioned their names, &c.) c] Retains the sentiments which it previously held (Jesus—the same kind, merciful God as before: we carry our holy or unholy sentiments into eternity.) d] That every tie which connected it with terrestrial things is dissolved. (The risen Saviour appears indeed—but that belongs to his mediatorial world—no abiding, as previously. c] That it enters its new and eternal sphere of action, (so Jesus ascended to heaven). II. The lessons applied. a] To believe, and not doubt. b] To entertain a Scriptural, not a superstitious faith. (No re-appearance on earth of the dead.) c] To love, and never hate (as we carry our sentiments into the eternal world.) d] To pass our time on earth with cheerful and holy hope.

Ps. 110: 1, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Introduction. ("Understandest thou what thou readeest?" (Acts 8: 30.) This question cannot be heartily answered in the affirmative by one who denies the Deity of Christ). I. "Thine enemies:" Jesus has enemies. a] Those who wilfully disown him (infidels.) b] Who practically deny him (unconverted.) II. "Until I make \* \* footstool:" These enemies will be

ferred the older divines, such as Dr. South, to later preachers. But he studied all, learned something from all and listened with close attention to many a sermon and lecture in Philadelphia from men greatly his inferiors, noting the good and marking the worthless, that he might be more efficient in the great work, to which he had consecrated himself, and present divine truth in the most simple and lucid manner. He was always willing to learn and his humility qualified him to be a learner. He never made any display of his powers or parade of his learning. There was always the greatest propriety in what he said and did. Brief, terse, always to the point, using the proper word in the proper place, rejecting all meretricious ornament, never wandering from the subject, every sentiment and expression, every illustration and argument had its influence in the discussion. His words, manner, matter, the tones of his voice, his attitude were in perfect keeping with the responsible service he was rendering to God, and for which, he knew he must give an account. All his sermons exhibited great versatility of talent, genius of a high order, and were always enriched by original, deep views of Scripture.

Dr. Demme was a most faithful Pastor, a model of diligence, fidelity and wisdom in the discharge of the various

of the text. a] Sublimity of love (represented by peace in this V.S.) b] Or by the divine judgment (hereafter.) III. "Footstool:" The completeness of the victory. a] Absolute helplessness. b] Deepest humiliation, of the enemies. IV. "Until I make:" The certainty of the victory. a] God can save (completeness.) b] He can execute such a purpose (veracity.) V. "Sit thou — hand:" The glory of the exalted Saviour. a] Undisputed authority "sit." b] Highest honor "right hand." c] Divine power "rule thou," ver. 2. VI. The evidences of this exaltation of Jesus. a] Out-pouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. b] Appearance to Stephen. c] Conversion of Paul. d] Destruction of Jerusalem. e] Revelation of St. John. f] The continued triumphs of the Church of Christ in the world.

TEXT, 2 Cor. 3: 5. "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." Introduction. (Man proud of intellectual strength—should be humble—what says apostle?) Theme.—*The powers of the mind, a work of God.* I. Proved. a] He endowed the mind with those powers (compare instinct of brutes.) b] He preserved them (mind, like body, liable to injury.) c] He developed them (in his Providence—compare savage tribes.) d] He ennobled [sanctified] them (by the Gospel) II. Duties thus imposed. a] Fervent gratitude (visit a Lunatic Asylum.) b] Humble enjoyment (pleasures of mind—mental employment.) c] Diligent cultivation (higher grades of intelligence.) d] Conscientious application (not to harm others by combining vice with talent, but to benefit others and glorify God.)



duties, pertaining to his office. On assuming charge of the congregation in Philadelphia, he preached his introductory from the words, "It is required in stewards that a man be found faithful. The points presented were—I must be faithful; I will be faithful." In this spirit he commenced his work, with this determination he prosecuted it. He always showed a conscientious regard for his official obligations and labored with the most earnest, affectionate interest for his people. Few men have exerted greater influence over their flock. He was their friend, their counsellor, their oracle, to whom they resorted on all occasions, and whose menitions and counsels they were always disposed to follow. With him there was no remissness, no shrinking from labor, no effort to escape responsibility. He was prompt, punctual and persevering in the performance of all his ordinary and most minute duties, with which no private interest, no literary consideration, no personal motive, was ever permitted to conflict. His motto was *Allis und in Allen Christus*, "Christ is all and in all," and he was true to the sentiment in his words and in his actions. He was wont to say, "I must work, while it is day, the night cometh, when no man can work." Even when confined to the house, his attachment to his old and loved work continued, and earnestly and steadfastly he prayed for his congregation. On the Lord's Day, as the familiar sound of the church-going bell reached his ears, he would clasp his hands and, with tears in his eyes, repeatedly exclaim, "Alas! alas! that I can no longer labor for my congregation." This characteristic interest in his people, his pure affection, grateful regard and tender solicitude for their future happiness, is seen in the following extract from a parting epistle to his family and found with his will after his death: "My beloved, thank, in my name, the congregation with which, by the grace of God, I have been so long united, and which through their vestry, through my colleagues and through many of its estimable members have treated me with so much kindness and sympathy. Tell them, they have been dear to me, that I have respected and loved them, that I have desired for them the rich blessing of God in Christ Jesus, and that I expect to go with this disposition towards them to the eternal world."

But his vast and varied powers were not confined to the individual church of which he was the Pastor; they were largely enjoyed and extended in their influence. He was very prominent in the ecclesiastical body, of which he was a

member, frequently being elected as its presiding officer, and serving on all its most important committees. He was distinguished for his business tact and for his practical views on all questions requiring the consideration of the Synod. He, also, frequently had young men, pursuing their theological studies under his care. He was a Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, and of Franklin College, an active and efficient Manager of the Pennsylvania Bible Society, a member of the American Tract Society and, in the earlier history of the Society, for many years, prepared Tracts, translating some, and revising others, for circulation among our German population. He was likewise, the faithful friend of the American Sunday School Union and manifested a warm and lively interest in the Prison Discipline Society. His views in reference to the treatment of criminals in connexion with the penal system were highly valued. He often visited the Eastern Penitentiary and Moyamensing Prison, and was most zealous in his efforts to reclaim the offenders. We remember with interest the occasion, when we accompanied him in one of these visitations, and how much concerned he seemed to be for the spiritual condition of one of the criminals, upon whom sentence of death had been already passed, and whose execution was near at hand. He regularly attended the meetings of the Prison Society and took a deep interest in its proceedings. Writes one, "I often saw him at these meetings, and wondered to see the bold preacher and fearless divine glide into the assembly and find a seat, his every movement seemingly deprecating any attention being bestowed upon him. Attention there always was, even in the meetings of the Prison Society, composed largely of Quakers; and those impassive Friends never failed to let it be seen that Dr. Demme had just come in. He did not often participate in the debates, but when he did speak he always secured the interest of all and his opinions had just weight."

Dr. Demme's time was so much occupied with official and other duties that his achievements in the department of authorship were not so great as some others, yet he accomplished something. He edited in the German the works of Josephus, carefully comparing the translation with the original, correcting the meaning and improving the language. It is not only an accurate and idiomatic rendering of the Greek into German, but it contains a large number of valuable notes, original and selected. The work is regarded by those who have carefully examined it, as one of great merit and

will always remain as a monument of the learning and industry of the editor. He also occasionally published a discourse, one, we remember, delivered before the Synod of Pennsylvania, which is richly instructive and furnishes an admirable exposition of his own evangelical views, and the other, a sermon on the death of Rev. Dr. Helmuth, which presents most faithfully a crucified Saviour and inculcates doctrines of the purest Gospel. Much was also done by him in the service of his Synod, in the preparation of manuals for the Church, such as *Liturgies and Hymn Books*.

In his theological views Dr. Demme held with unwavering tenacity the great doctrines of the Christian system, ever delighting in Biblical forms of expression, and making them his constant theme. He was emphatically a student of the Scriptures, deriving his opinions directly from the living fountains of Divine truth. He never affected, or attempted the least originality in his theological conceptions, always preferring with the simplicity of a child to follow the plain teachings of God's word, forming his own opinions in view of all the facts without reference to those of others, and uttering them with that independence which feared no antagonist. Yet he never entangled himself in theological metaphysics, doctrinal controversies, or polemic discussions. The Symbols of the Church he regarded with great veneration. He looked upon them as the productions of able men, a precious legacy, bequeathed to the Church by its immortal founders, as an admirable summary of doctrinal truth. His theological reading was, however, confined to no narrow, or sectarian limits. He was familiar with the whole range of theological science, and was ready to receive and approve what was valuable in any system. He was a man of tolerant, liberal spirit, and had great charity for those who differed from him in sentiment, provided they held to the central principle of justification by faith, and obeyed the essential truth as it is in Jesus Christ. He labored peacefully with Christians of other denominations and wished them success in their efforts to build up the Redeemer's kingdom. He was slow in his condemnation of others, and ready to do justice to all. We remember, on a certain occasion, his referring to the Catholic controversy and strongly disapproving of the spirit, with which it was conducted. He said he was opposed to denunciation, that we should be willing to adopt from others what is good and reject what is wrong,

yet, he added, "I would rather die than become a Roman Catholic."

In his private character Dr. Demme was a man of great personal worth. Wherever he was known, he was admired and esteemed. Engaging in his disposition, affable in his manners, pure, simple, true, instructive in his intercourse, kind and obliging, he had gathered around him a large circle of devoted friends and enjoyed their unlimited confidence. His heart was replete with tender affections and alive to benevolent, generous impulses. He was distinguished for his strong friendships, his genial humor and his ready sympathy with all that affected the welfare of those around him.—A superficial acquaintance with him might have produced the impression that he was cold and shy in his feelings, reserved and inaccessible, but it was a mistake. No one possessed a warmer heart, or was more sincere or cordial in his attachments. His dignity, self-respect and sense of propriety forbade, it is true, all levity and undue familiarity. This was sometimes by the young, ascribed to sternness and austerity of character, which tend to repel and alienate, but there was nothing more erroneous; no one could have taken a deeper, more affectionate interest in their happiness and success. He was very modest and unassuming in regard to his own merits. He was a patient listener to the views of others, and his opinions were always expressed with great diffidence. There was nothing of the oracular or dogmatic in his manner. In conversation he scarcely ever referred to himself, or directed attention to his actions. If he had taken the great Napoleon prisoner at Waterloo, or had discovered a new world, no mention of either event would have passed his lips. Although so gentle and unobtrusive, and even shrinking in matters that were merely incidental he was inflexible in all essentials. His was no negative character. He was very decided in the expression of his views and courageous in the vindication of truth. When he was once satisfied that he was right, his face was as flint. He feared no man in the discharge of his duty. He was free and fearless and called no man, master. He was never hasty or superficial in coming to his conclusions. He never determined any question, until he had deliberately surveyed it in all its bearings, and gathered all the information he could procure. But when he had collected all the data and made up his mind, he did not feel inclined to review the subject, or reverse his judgment. His decision was absolute; the process



had been equitable and a second investigation without additional evidence he felt could have produced only the same result. He was remarkable for his punctuality, his care and accuracy in every thing he did, and his unwearied industry. He was a man of unaffected simplicity, child-like and frank in his disposition, and had an uncommonly sensitive regard for what is honorable. He was most patient in his study of the truth, tenacious in his search and resolute in adhering to principle, perfectly regardless of consequences, and submitting the issue to God. No one was more free than he from that spirit of envy and jealousy, which is the bane of so many of our public men. He never supposed that the elevation of another, in the least reduced him, and hence he never sought to depress him that he might exalt himself. He felt that God had a special mission and a particular place for every individual, and thus all reasonable ground for dissension and unhallowed ambition was excluded. The meanness of petty rivalry, the ebullitions of personal strife, the stratagems often employed, and ever watching for opportunities to magnify self and to attract public attention, were held in great detestation by this Christian scholar. He never indulged in ungenerous insinuations or spoke disparagingly of his brethren. We never knew him to be severe in his reprehension of men, except when they were practicing cunning or duplicity. He despised with all the intensity of his intense nature all double-dealing and petty intrigue, and was apt to deal with such conduct as it deserved. He never resorted to any sinister or dishonorable means to gain influence and power. He never abused his position for the attainment of personal advantage. It was impossible to be for any length of time in his society without being deeply impressed with the purity and elevation of his whole character. He was a man of stern principle, of unimpeachable integrity, as sincere and honest a man, as you ever encountered. You always knew where to find him on all questions. When you heard him speak, you were sure that the whole man spoke, that there were no false appearances, or pretensions about him. He had nothing of that disguise and policy, that time-serving spirit which you notice in some persons. He was more anxious to *be*, than to *seem* righteous.\* He was an Israelite, in whom there was no guile. His motives of right and wrong were founded, not upon the maxims of

\* Οὐ γὰρ δοκεῖν δίκαιος ἀλλ εἶναι θέλει



the world, but upon the laws of religion and of God. He had a keen sense of his moral responsibility.

In social life he was a most delightful companion. In this respect he was much of Luther's turn of mind. In hours of relaxation, at his meals, and in social intercourse, in the circle of near friends, he was cheerful and full of anecdote, but he never seemed to forget his ministerial character. His conversations always conveyed some interesting, historical, ethical or instructive truth. Yet he held in abhorrence every thing like cant, and would never degrade the man in the clergymen. He suffered, however, physically from the restraint so often placed upon men of his profession, and sometimes complained that the recreation, which of all others benefited him most, was not within his daily reach. For the rights of another he could have braved the scaffold, but his modesty forbade a crusade on behalf of his own interests. He had an excellent knowledge of music, and, in his earlier years was a skilful performer on the piano. He was a true philanthropist, a man of unostentatious benevolence and unbounded liberality to the poor. He was willing to make personal sacrifices to promote their comfort and advance their welfare. Every thing, of which he took hold, was characterized by great vigor.

Although attached to his native land, he was an enthusiastic admirer of our social and political institutions. He was one of our most loyal citizens. He loved his adopted land with a fervor that was most intense. He was also very decided in his political sentiments. He never, however, introduced politics into the pulpit, although he was willing to converse in private on the subject with his more intimate friends. His hatred of Slavery was very strong. Years ago, when the institution in the North had more admirers and apologists than it now has, his opposition to it was decided, open and unrelenting.

Dr. Demme was a devout, high-toned Christian, a man of deep religious feeling. His piety was not of the negative, formal, sentimental inconsistent kind, so characteristic of many of the present time, but a life in the soul, a principle that regulated all his actions, controlled his whole course, appeared in all his labors, a deep, healthful, vigorous, absorbing love of the Saviour. Living near to God, humbly adoring the works of Providence, viewing every occurrence and event in connexion with religious truth, his life was

the embodiment of the teachings he so ably presented from year to year, the result of severe effort and many a conflict. He loved religion from an inward conviction of its divine power, from personal experience of its great value. He made it the guiding principle of all his actions, and always evinced a most tender regard, a cheerful submission to the Divine will. He was thoroughly acquainted with the Word of God, and for devotional purposes read it daily in the version of Luther. The doctrine of a crucified Saviour was very dear to his heart—one upon which he loved to dwell. Whilst he was never disposed to make a display of his internal experience, or to speak of his indwelling graces, he seemed to watch his heart with great care; his life and precepts illustrated his sincerity and adorned his walk. He remained faithful till the last. Even after all intercourse with his fellow men was broken off, he seemed to enjoy intimate and blessed communion with his Father in heaven. The Bible was his constant companion, and prayer his daily, favorite occupation. Even when his mental faculties lost their power, and reason became impaired, the habit had become so strong that he would sit with the Scriptures before him, his hands reverently folded and his heart earnestly engaged in supplications at the mercy-seat. The God of all consolation heard his anxious supplications and, in his own good time, removed him from this world of gloom to the realms of light, to the eternal sunshine of his glory. That Jesus, whom he had so long and earnestly commended to others, in the hour of dissolution was near to sustain him and give him the victory over his last enemy.

We met the subject of our sketch for the last time in 1856. Well do we recall his appearance, the conversation, the impression he left upon our mind. We then supposed his stay on earth would be brief. He referred with much feeling to his impaired health, the failure of his memory, the termination of his usefulness. He spoke with confidence of the future, the "rest which remaineth to the people of God," of the union of believers with Christ, and of the recognition of friends in another world. He has now entered upon that rest, has been more fully united to that Saviour whom he so much loved, has recognized in the realms of glory dear departed ones who preceded him. He has passed away, but his works shall not pass away. He did not live in vain. Being dead he yet speaketh, and his influence will be felt till the end of time.

"He was," says a brother,\* who knew him well, "doubtless one of the finest characters our age has produced, mentally and morally, so admirably proportioned one knows not whether most to love the beauty of his whole character or survey it with wondering reverence. The more nearly his image approaches me in distinct lines, the more deeply I feel how truly he may be called *a great and good man*."

FROM THE REV. C. P. KRAUTH, D. D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

GETTYSBURG, FEB, 10, 1864.

Dear Sir: You ask of me some expression in regard to the character and services of Rev. Dr. C. R. Demme, recently removed by death from the Church militant after a ministry of forty-four years, the greater part of the time in the German Lutheran Churches in Philadelphia. You apply to me, because you know that I had ample opportunities of knowing him, that we labored together for some years in the same general field, that we were on the most friendly relation to each other and that I had a high regard for his personal and professional worth. My compliance with your desire is not reluctant, though I feel that it is difficult to know our fellow men sufficiently to warrant any positive opinion, except on a very few points.

With all our study of ourselves, the book constantly before us, reading every day, and aiming to exhaust the task, our scholarship is, at best, very low, and the point of graduation remote. Although there may be peculiar difficulties in the way of self-knowledge, the judge being subjected to strong temptations to render a verdict too favorable to the client, it is more difficult in the case of others; here the bias, in the opposite direction, of undue rigor, may vitiate the process. The truth, if not reached in the highest degree, may be approximated, and this can be expected, where the tribunal is competent and the facilities for understanding the case have been great, and of long duration. Setting up no pretensions as to superior qualifications, there may be a compensation in the other particulars. Dr. Demme was well known to the writer. Much intercourse, of the most cordial character, took place between them and much opportunity was afforded of judging in regard to capacity, native talents, culture, religious sentiment, professional ability and fidelity. What we know, what we have seen, we testify.

Dr. Demme came to the United States, when he was quite a young man. Of his life before his arrival in this country, the writer knows but little. His father was the Rev. Dr. Demme who occupied the high position of Superintendent in the German Church, a sphere in which men of distinction as divines move. His father was not without distinction in the field of authorship. One of his brothers, a physician, or rather a surgeon, of high standing I met and became acquainted with, on his visit to Philadelphia. Another brother, a jurist, attained distinction in his profession. Dr. Demme belonged to a family of distinguished men, distinguished in Theology, Jurisprudence and Medicine.

I believe, at one time, his own predilections were for the Law but like our own Luther, he was diverted from his purpose and devoted his

\*Prof. C. F. Schaeffer, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

talents to the salvation of men. It would be interesting to know, how he was led into a new sphere, in which he was destined to attain so much honor and to do so much good. Some one may have the materials but we fear not, as he ever manifested a backwardness in speaking of himself. To express, in a few words, our estimate of him; he was a man of uncommon abilities, talents of the highest order, a man of polished education, a refined man, an upright man who hated all double-dealing, a well read theologian, an able preacher, a faithful pastor, a true philanthropist. A life devoted to the best interests of humanity he lived, and having passed away from the toils and sorrows of earth, he has, we trust, received the reward of the just.

Yours sincerely,

C. P. KRAUTH.

FROM F. A. PACKARD, LL. D.

PHILADELPHIA, DEC. 25, 1863.

My Dear Professor: You could scarcely have assigned me a more pleasant task (were I competent to execute it) than that suggested in your note of the 18th inst.; but the moment I turn my thoughts towards the character of my lamented friend, Dr. Demme, as it presents itself to my memory, I shrink from the attempt to portray it, so conscious am I of my unfitness. I will venture, however, to give you some of the impressions which my intercourse with him left upon my mind, in the hope that they may confirm, if they do not enlarge your own.

My first opportunity to become much acquainted with the Doctor was some fifteen or twenty years ago, at Long Branch, where, with our respective families we spent a few days under the same roof. The company, though not numerous, was very diverse in character, habits and opinions, and there were not wanting occasions to try his consistency and fidelity to his Master's cause; but with a courtesy, dignity and propriety which were universally noticed and appreciated, he maintained an unexceptional deportment, both as a Christian and a Gospel minister. Many incidents occurred which called forth his good humour and showed his parental and domestic character to eminent advantage.

The intercourse thus opened continued with increased intimacy from year to year. His onerous pastoral duties absorbed most of his time and thoughts, and it was not often that I felt at liberty to interrupt him in his study, so that I knew but little of my dear friend *at home*: and though he seldom called at my office without an apology for what he called an intrusion, it was my own fault if he ever left it without leaving me a wiser and better man than he found me.

Among the most conspicuous traits of his natural character was extreme *modesty*. Of all men I have ever known he was one of the most unobtrusive. With all his vast erudition and his indisputable title to the respect and deference of scholars and philosophers, he seemed to shrink from notoriety. Whilst his opinions were evidently the result of deep reflection and close discrimination, they were always expressed with the utmost diffidence. When any important principle was involved, however, and especially any that seemed to affect, even remotely, the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, no man



could be more prompt, bold and indomitable than Dr. Demme in upholding truth and opposing error, yet it was always with meekness and heavenly charity.

With great vividness I call to mind the warmth and cordiality of the good man's *friendship*. His countenance lighted up with smiles and his eye beaming with kindness, with what eagerness would he grasp a friend's hand, and with what frank and hearty ingenuousness would he impart liberally from the affluence of his own mind and heart. With a keen relish of humor and yet with a scrupulous regard to the proprieties of his vocation, he enjoyed a merry laugh as thoroughly as any one I ever knew. He had a large acquaintance with human character and temperament, and adapted himself with great ease and propriety to them, without at all compromising his own principles.

His devotion to his official duties was most exemplary. No literary or social entertainment, no claim of private interest or personal friendship was ever allowed to interfere with a pastoral duty or engagement. And when he has sometimes casually referred to the items on his memorandum, the calls on sick or bereaved parishioners, the funerals, the weddings, the lectures and the catechisings, besides the preparation for the public services of the Lord's Day, it seemed as if only an iron constitution and the most rigid economy of time would have enabled him to fulfil his round of avocations. When most pressed with duties and cares he was calm and self-possessed, never betraying any haste or confusion, but with even step and conscious equanimity addressing himself to the duties of the hour.

Dr. Demme was a man of *exquisite sensitiveness*. I do not mean by this that a scene or tale of cruelty or suffering would move him more than others, though his sympathies were certainly very acute; but I refer rather to his quick perception of injustice or oppression in the dealings of the rich with the poor, the strong with the weak, and the shrewd with the simple. The frequency with which, through defects of legislation, imperfection of testimony or unavoidable errors of judgment, the perpetrators of wrong escape, while those whom they have deceived and betrayed are left to suffer; and the still more numerous instances in which the forms of law are prostituted to purposes of selfishness and private revenge, filled him with grief and indignation; nothing would sooner suffuse his eyes and flush his manly face than a revelation of this kind.

Though our friend was an ardent admirer of our social and political institutions he never concealed his strong attachment to his fatherland. And his untiring efforts to promote the welfare of his countrymen on our shores, were among the crowning graces of his character. Whenever it was in his power to relieve their distress or perplexity; to put them in the way of success, or to rescue them from error none could do it more promptly and cheerfully than he. Perhaps this was one of the motives that led him to take so active an interest in the subject of Penitentiary discipline; and it was in this connexion that my own intimate acquaintance with him came to pass. A German emigrant arriving in our country, a perfect stranger to its language and institutions, having fallen into the hands of knavish men, and been betrayed into some grave offence, is doomed to imprisonment. Our warm-hearted friend hears of it and hastens to his cell. With the generous pity of a fellow man and with the higher and holier sympathies of a minister of "the Friend of publicans and sinners," Dr.



Demme gives him his hand, the hand of his own countryman and while he is careful not to palliate the sin he gently opens to the desponding prisoner the path of penitence and amendment, and gilds his lowering future with a ray of hope. Again and again does he tread those silent corridors and carry the sunshine of sympathy and encouragement into those solitary cells. His astute observation revealed many defects to be supplied and many abuses to be corrected, and hence he takes part in the counsels and plans of a Society, then in efficient life, whose object is to "alleviate the miseries of public prisons." Though his characteristic modesty forbids his making himself prominent in the discussions, his practical wisdom and large experience give great weight to his opinions. Dr. Demme was neither a speech-maker nor a theorist. He was emphatically a *worker*. With true zeal he embarked in the effort to improve the condition and prospects of the imprisoned offender and while others were spinning out speeches and theories, the poor prisoner felt the good Doctor's heart throbbing in sympathy with his own, and the actual reform was thus auspiciously begun!

With an intense aversion to all manner of sham and fustian he had not the least degree of *opinionativeness*. On the contrary he was a most patient and considerate listener to the views of others, and always seemed prepared to yield anything and everything to convictions of truth. I had occasion more than once to test this trait in his character. Our interviews were characterized by the utmost freedom in discussing the characters and opinions of men and the phases of public affairs, and I do not remember an instance in which he planted a prejudice in my mind, or spoke disparagingly of any living being. He deeply lamented the controversies in which the professed disciples of Christ are involved, and while he was valiant for the truth and earnest to heal divisions he never assumed the province of a judge, much less that of a censor.

A casual interview with Dr. Demme would probably have left the impression that he was a cold, phlegmatic inaccessible man whose intimacies would be "few and far between." And yet a warmer heart could not be found than his, nor a richer array of loving friends than he left. There were silent testimonies to this, when his end came, that could not be feigned, nor concealed.

A few days after the Doctor's return from his visit to his native land, he called at my office one morning, and after the usual genial smile and cordial greeting, he began to tell me about a report on some subject in which we felt a common interest. "It is by" — said the Doctor, pausing, putting his hand to his forehead and adding "Do you see? I cannot remember the name. I cannot remember any name. It has come upon me suddenly. It seems to be a failure of the faculty in that particular only, for I can remember dates and facts without any difficulty."

Two or three times during our brief interview the same thing occurred and it seemed but a few days before other tokens of an impaired memory were manifested, and gradually other powers of his noble mind passed under a cloud and never emerged till his heavenly mansion was ready for him and he doubtless entered it with shouts of praise and triumph.

A man of larger charity, more genial temper, deeper sympathies, greater modesty, a warmer heart, or a better endowed

and furnished mind, has not lived and died within the circle of my acquaintance.

Yours very truly,

F. A. PACKARD.

FROM THE REV. ALONZO POTTER, D. D., LL. D.

BISHOP IN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

PHILADELPHIA, JAN. 4, 1864.

My dear Prof. Stoever: Pardon my unintentional delay in answering yours of the 19th ultimo. I regret that my acquaintance with Dr. Demme was too slight to enable me to add anything to your store of reminiscences. I met him more rarely than I could have wished in the social circle, and saw him occasionally in the Board of Trustees of the University, in the American Philosophical Society, &c. He drew me to him (as he must have done with others) by the magnetism of a warm and generous heart and a clear head. He was one of those men whom you never meet without wishing you could see them oftener, and know them most intimately. In public I never heard him but once, when addressing a large congregation in Harrisburg, on behalf of the Bible Society. He spoke his native language, which I understood too imperfectly to follow him, but with a force and a pathos which, combined with his impressive manner, prepared me to believe what I had heard of his power in the pulpit. He struck me as a man of generous culture and large understanding and his retirement, therefore, impressed me the more sadly.

Yours faithfully,

ALONZO POTTER.

FROM THE REV. PETER WOLLE,

BISHOP IN THE MORAVIAN CHURCH.

BETHLEHEM, PA., FEB. 15, 1864.

My Dear Brother: Your favor of the 10th inst., came to hand on Saturday last and gave me much pleasure. Allow me to say, that, although thirty years have elapsed since I have had any intercourse with our late friend and brother, I still think with gratification of the friendly and brotherly relation that subsisted between us, of the repeated meetings at his house, of Reverends Helfenstein, Krauth and self with him for the purpose of revising Tracts, translated by us into German for the American Tract Society, then in its infancy, and of the occasional opportunities, with which I was favored to hear him in the pulpit, or at funerals. I always entertained the highest regard for him as a most eloquent and earnest preacher of the Gospel and cherished warm affection toward him because of his kind and friendly disposition.

With the sincere desire that God may bless you in the important work committed to your hands, I remain

Your friend and brother,

PETER WOLLE.

# ARTICLE VIII.

## REMARKS UPON THE MEANING OF βαπτίζω IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By E. GREENWALD, D. D., Easton, Pa.

WE are accustomed to read in treatises that discuss the mode of Baptism, learned and very carefully conducted criticisms upon the meaning of the word βαπτίζω, as it was used by classic Greek authors. But is it not much more satisfactory in relation to the question of the mode of a Christian Sacrament that is never spoken of in classic Greek authors, but in the New Testament alone, to inquire how this word was used by the writers of the New Testament? As the Greek of the New Testament is, as all admit, not pure classic Greek, but has peculiarities of its own, it may well be supposed that the New Testament writers will furnish the most satisfactory indications of the sense in which they used words. An appeal to them must, therefore, be more conclusive as to the meaning of the word βαπτίζω in connection with the Sacrament of baptism, than an appeal to classic writers to whom the Sacrament of baptism was unknown. Such an appeal is not only satisfactory, but absolutely conclusive. As a specimen of the results of such investigation we submit the following :

In Acts 1 : 5. we find, "John truly baptized with water," — βαπτισεν ὑδατι — "but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" — βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Now, this word must necessarily, in some measure, describe the mode, as well as the nature, of the transaction to which it relates. It means to dip, or it does not mean to dip, and the use of the word in this case will determine its meaning. If the mode of βαπτισεν ὑδατι, "baptized with water," is doubtful, the action expressed by βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι is positively certain; and therefore, that which is certain fixes the meaning of that which is supposed to be doubtful. Let us follow up the investigation.

In Acts 2 : 1-4, the baptism of the Holy Ghost here referred to, is described as consisting of the Holy Ghost, in

the form of human tongues, cloven or cleft, luminous, like little lighted tapers, descending from the ceiling of the room where the disciples were assembled, and one such cloven tongue sitting upon each of them. *Εκαθίστέ τε ἐφ' ἑνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν.* *Εκαθίστε* expresses this action, and means sat upon. As there were one hundred and thirty persons in the room, there was a rain of jets of flame, resembling tongues, consisting of one hundred and thirty drops, one of which settled upon each person present. So it would have appeared to a spectator, looking on from a distance. This action was foretold and described by the word *βαπτισθήσεσθε*, and its use to designate it, settles the question of its meaning. But if there could be any doubt about the meaning of the language used to relate the occurrence in Acts 2: 1-4, the reference to it in other passages is not doubtful. When Peter immediately afterward explained the transaction, he describes it in the 17th v. of the same chapter, by a quotation from Joel, and uses the words, *ἐκχέω ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου ἐπὶ πάντας σαρκας*, "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." *ἐκχέω* means to pour out, to pour forth. (The Hebrew word which occurs in Joel, and which is expressed by the Greek word *ἐκχέω*, is the word *שָׁפַךְ* from the root *שָׁפַךְ*, which means to pour out, to pour out as a libation, to shed blood, to pour out one's soul in tears, &c.) In still further explanation of it, Peter in the 33d v. of the same chapter, uses the words *ἐκχέει τοῦτο*—"hath shed forth," poured forth, this. *ἐκχέει* is the 3d per. sing. imp. of the verb *ἐκχέω*, and of course, has the same meaning. This is decisive as to the kind of action described by the word *βαπτισθήσεσθε*, and fixes it to be not dipping, but sprinkling or pouring.

But decisive as these quotations are, the investigation is by no means concluded. In the 10th ch. of the Acts, it is related that Peter went into the house of Cornelius, and preached Christ unto them. Whilst he was speaking, they too were baptized with the Holy Ghost, as the disciples had been on the day of Pentecost. This is described in the 44th v. by the words *ἐπέπεσε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὸν λόγον*, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word." *ἐπέπεσε* is the 3d per. sing. aor. 2d ind. act. of the verb *ἐπιπίπτω*, to fall upon—derived from *ἐπι*, upon, and *πίπτω*, to fall. In the 45th v. the astonishment of the Jewish companions of Peter at the descent of the Holy Ghost upon a Gentile family, is related, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost is described by the words, *καὶ ἐκέλευσεν* "and he commanded

καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκέχυνται “were astonished that on the Gentiles also the gift of the Holy Ghost was poured out.” The word ἐκκέχυνται is the 3d sing. perf. pass. of ἐκχυνω, which means to pour out, or pour forth. When Peter returned to Jerusalem, he was called to account by the Jewish Christians there, for having gone into the family of a Gentile, preached the Gospel to them, and admitted them by baptism into the Christian church. He defended himself by saying as recorded Acts 11: 15, “As I began to speak —ἐπέπεσε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ὥσπερ καὶ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ” “the Holy Ghost fell on them even as on us at the beginning.” Here he uses the same word, ἐπίπεσε, which had been used in the 44th v. of the previous chapter, to describe the occurrence, and which we have seen means to fall upon. Then in the next, or 16th v., he quotes, Acts 1: 5, the very words of the Saviour himself, containing the original promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost which would take place on the day of Pentecost, saying, “Then remembered I the word of the Lord how that he said John truly — βαπτισεν υἱαὺν — baptized with water, but ye — βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ — shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.” Here the descent, pouring upon, falling down upon, of the Holy Ghost, he expressly calls being *baptized* with the Holy Ghost. The act intended by our Lord by the word βαπτισθήσεσθε, is described by the words ἐκαθίσε, ἐκχυνω, ἐξεχέε, ἐπέπεσε, and ἐκκέχυνται, all of which mean to descend, to pour, to fall upon. Does not this settle the meaning of the word βαπτισθήσεσθε, as applied to the Holy Ghost? Was not the act which it describes, a pouring, a falling upon, a sprinkling? Was there in it the remotest resemblance to a dipping? Does not this use of the word, moreover, settle and fix the meaning of the word itself, in its New Testament sense, so far as it is descriptive of the mode of an act? When applied to the Holy Ghost, it means pouring or falling upon; does it describe a different mode, when it is applied to water? Of course, not. If in the baptism with the Holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost fell, or was poured upon them, and this act was described by the word βαπτισθήσεσθε, a future tense of the verb βαπτίζω, was not their baptism with water, which is described by the word βάπτισεν, a past tense of the same verb, performed in the same manner? Was not the mode described by the one, the identical mode described by the other? Does not the same word express the same mode? If the baptism with the Holy Ghost was described by this word, and means pouring,



what reason have we to suppose that the same word in the same sentence, means a totally different and opposite mode, namely dipping, when used to describe the baptism with water? Is not such an interpretation arbitrary, false, and an obvious perversion of the language of the word of God? It seems, from the foregoing, clear beyond all controversy, that the writers of the New Testament used the word βαπτίζω, to designate, not the act or mode of dipping, but that of pouring or sprinkling. Their use of the word, and not that of Pagan writers, is to determine the sense in which we are to understand it.

## ARTICLE IX.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*The Federalist: A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States.* A collection of Essays, By Alexander Hamilton, Jay and Madison. Also the *Continentalist* and other papers by Hamilton. Edited by John C. Hamilton, Author of the *History of the Republic of the United States*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. At this late day, it is unnecessary to say any thing in praise of a work, which from the commencement of our national existence, has been regarded of the highest authority. The views of Hamilton and those, who were associated with him, possess just now additional interest and value. The edition before us gives an historical notice of the events, which led to the production of the work, and appends several important historical documents. It is a handsome octavo of 660 pages, printed on paper of heavy texture and in large clear type, presenting a very attractive appearance. It is a valuable addition to any Library.

*Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States, Developed in the Official and Historical Annals of the Republic.* By B. F. Morris. Philadelphia: G. W. Childs. 1864. The object of this volume is to give, in a connected form, the Christian history of our country, and to unfold the basis upon which our civil institutions stand. It is a storehouse of facts gathered from approved standard works, and will be found by all classes a most valuable book for reference. The author, in speaking of the German Lutheran Church, correctly says: "This denomination has ever been distinguished for its zeal in learning and its devotion to the cause of civil and religious liberty." The volume contains an interesting "Address of the Ministers, Church Wardens and Vestrymen of the German Lutheran congregations in and near Philadelphia to his Excellency George Washington, President of the United States," in which they express their gratification with his election, and their admiration for his

character, assuring him "that there is no body of people whatsoever that can, or ever shall, exceed those, with whom they are connected, in affection for his person, confidence in his abilities, patriotism and distinguished goodness;" adding that they "will never cease to address the throne of grace with the same warmth and sincerity of heart for his present and everlasting happiness, as for their own." Washington, in his reply, rejoices in the opportunity afforded of reciprocating his esteem, and remarks that "from the excellent character, the diligence, sobriety and virtue which the Germans, in general, who are settled in America, have ever maintained, he cannot forbear felicitating himself on receiving from so respectable a number of them such strong assurances of their affection for his purpose, confidence in his integrity and zeal to support him in his endeavors to promote the welfare of their common country."

*The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution.* By J. T. Headley. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864. This is also a book of historical value in connexion with the religious element in our struggle for independence. Many interesting facts, incidents and anecdotes, in the life and labors of the ministry during these trying scenes are here brought to light. The author "regrets that he could obtain nothing satisfactory respecting the Lutheran Church which rendered the country good service." Still we cannot excuse him. It was his duty, in preparing a work of this kind, to secure the requisite material, and with the proper effort he would not have failed. The clergymen of the Lutheran Church were particularly distinguished for their patriotism, and their devotion to the American Revolution. *Henry Melchior Muhlenberg's* life, on account of his principles, was often exposed to peril. He was threatened by British and Hessian officers with prison, torture and death. But he continued fearlessly to advocate the cause of freedom. *John Nicholas Kurtz* was Pastor at York at the time Congress was in session there. His sympathy and interest were manifested by the most earnest appeals from the pulpit. After preaching on the Lord's Day he would sell his people to gather all the articles of apparel they could spare and send them to his residence for distribution among the destitute soldiers. *Christian Henry Helmuth* carried his principles so far that he would not allow silence on the subject, maintaining that it was the duty of every citizen unequivocally and openly to sustain the Government. *John Frederick Schmidt*, who was Pastor at Germantown during the Revolutionary War, took so decided a position in favor of the efforts made for independence that when the enemy occupied the town, he was compelled to flee for safety. "We have experienced the evils of tyranny," said *John Ernst Bergman*, "in our own land; for the sake of liberty we have left home, houses, estates, and have taken refuge in the wilds of Georgia; shall we now submit again to bondage? No, never!" *Christian Streib* and *Henry Moller* were Chaplains in the Army, and *Peter G. Muhlenberg* left the pulpit for the field. But it is unnecessary to multiply instances. With the exception of the faithless Triebner, all our ministers, cotemporary with this eventful period were among the most enthusiastic friends of the American Revolution.

*Chronicles of the Schenck-Cotta Family.* By two of themselves. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1864. This is a charming book, designed to reproduce the times of the Reformation and to give the reader a more vivid and impressive idea of that eventful period than the ordinary his-

torical narratives, and written with a skill and power seldom equalled. The great interest of the book consists in its successful illustration of the gradual progress in the great change experienced in the views and feelings of the Reformer in reference to his personal acceptance with God. To our own Church the work will be found specially useful, and should be extensively circulated by thousands over the whole country.

*Expository Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism.* By George W. Bethune, D. D. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1864. Dr. Bethune, who has so recently passed away from the scene of action was regarded as one of the most brilliant preachers of the day. He was an accomplished scholar and a gifted writer. These Lectures on the Catechism of his Church were prepared with great care in the vigor of his intellect, and designed for the highest and most permanent usefulness. They present clearly and forcibly the views of Christian doctrine, as held by the Calvinistic school of Reformers, and are a valuable contribution to theological literature. How much gratified we should be, to have some one in our own Church, competent for the task, prepare a series of Lectures on the Augsburg Confession, to which there seems to be a growing attachment manifested in all parts of the Church. What important service could thus be rendered.

*The National Almanac and Annual Record for the year 1864.* Philadelphia, G. W. Childs. 1864. This work seems established in the public favor on a firm basis. No publication of the kind has ever been more kindly received. As a compend of statistics, as a record of facts, for the extent and variety of its information on every subject that pertains to our own country and the countries of the whole civilized world, it is without a rival. It is a manual of great interest and value. We found the volume of last year exceedingly useful for reference, furnishing material, which could not have been secured elsewhere without considerable research. This is still more valuable than its predecessor, and no Library without it can be regarded as complete.

*Autobiography, Correspondence, etc., of Lyman Beecher, D. D.* Edited by Charles Beecher. With Illustrations. In two Volumes. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1864. This is the record of one of the ablest and most eloquent divines our country has produced. He was born in the year of the Declaration of Independence, was graduated at Yale College, commenced his ministry in Long Island, and filled various posts of usefulness and honor. His reputation was widely established. The volume before us consists of letters of the family, based upon a skeleton of the Doctor's life furnished by himself. It is made up of dialogues, monologues, reminiscences, narratives and illustrations. It is a general biography which will be eagerly read. The publishers have brought the book out in excellent style.

*Thoughts for the Christian Life.* By Rev. James Drummond. With an Introduction by J. G. Holland. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864. These discourses by a Congregational minister are far above ordinary pulpit productions. They abound in original, vigorous thought, and impressive, earnest suggestions which cannot fail to delight and instruct the reader. Dr. Holland, who sat under his ministry, introduces the work to the public in a most beautiful, touching essay on the life and character of the author.

*Synonyms of the New Testament.* By Richard Chevenix Trench, D. D. Second Part. Charles Scribner. 1864. Trench's works are all valuable. This is an admirable book for all who are interested in the study of the New Testament in the original Greek. On every page we find evidence of careful research, worthy of our attention and study. For example, opening the volume at random, how satisfactory the distinction between *νέος* and *καιρός* and *παλιός*, *ἕμνος* and *ᾠδή*.

*Christian Memorials of the War: or Scenes and Incidents illustrative of Religious Faith and Principle, Patriotism and Bravery in our Army.* With Historical Notes. By Horatia B. Hackett Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. Professor Hackett has presented us with a work of great interest to the Christian Patriot. It consists of valuable fragments in the history of the War, gathered together and classified under the following heads: (1) Fighting for the Government, acknowledged as a Christian duty; (2) Soldiers of the Cross in the Army; (3) Courage promoted by trust in God; (4) Cheerful submission to hardships and sufferings; (5) Efforts for the spiritual welfare of the soldiers; (6) Happy deaths of brave men; (7) Our dependence on God for success; (8) Incidents of the camp and battle-field.

*The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man.* With remarks on theories of the origin of species by variation. By Sir Charles Lyell. F. R. S. Illustrated by wood cuts. Second American from the latest London edition. Philadelphia: G. W. Childs. 1863. All the recent investigations, connected with the antiquity of the race, are here brought together, a large amount of geological information presented, and the whole subject treated with candor. We, of course, differ from the author in some of his conclusions. The book contains no formal attack upon our faith, but its design is to show that man has existed on the earth thousands of years longer than the Scriptural narrative warrants us to suppose. We have, however, no fears as to the final results of these and other scientific researches. Their tendency will be to strengthen our belief in Revelation and ultimately assist us in the interpretation of Divine truth. *Nunquam aliud Natura, aliud Sapientia dicit.*

*A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe.* By John William Draper, M. D., LL. D., Professor in the University of New York. Second Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1864. This object of this work is to show that social advancement is as completely under the control of natural law, as is bodily growth—that the life of an individual is a miniature of the life of a nation. The discussion covers the entire ground of European progress in accordance with physiological principles. It is a masterly production, profound and instructive, a most interesting contribution to the department of speculative philosophy.

*Man and Nature; or Physical Geography as modified by Human Action.* By George P. Marsh. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864. The object of the accomplished author, who here appears in a new field of labor, is to indicate the character and, approximately, the extent of the changes produced by human action in the physical conditions of the globe we inhabit; to point out the dangers of imprudence and the necessity of caution in all operations which, on a large scale, interfere with the spontaneous arrangements of the organic or inorganic world; to suggest the possibility and the importance of the restoration of disturbed harmonies, and the material improvement of waste and exhausted regions; and incidentally to illustrate the doctrine that man

is, in both kind and degree, a power of a higher order than any of the other forms of animated life, which, like him, are nourished at the table of bounteous nature. There is a large amount of facts, with important suggestions, gathered together in this volume and presented in a perspicuous and interesting manner, indicating extended research and great skill in its preparation.

*Thoughts on Sabbath Schools.* By John S. Hart, LL. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. The proper aim of Sabbath Schools, their relations to the family and the Church, the best methods of promoting their efficiency, the qualifications and duties of superintendent and teachers, the modes of imparting instruction, are the leading topics, discussed in the volume. Professor Hart has thoroughly studied the whole subject, and the wisdom and practical character of the views presented will make the book valuable and useful to all who are interested in this important work.

*The Golden Censer: Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer.* By John S. Hart, LL. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. This is a finished production, worthy of our study on account of its rich development of truth, and the many practical suggestions which it contains. The work cannot fail to elevate the mind and touch the heart of the devout believer.

*Satan's Devices and the Believer's Victory.* By Rev. W. L. Parsons, A. M., Pastor of the Congregational Church, Mattapoisett, Mass. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. The book is altogether of a practical character, based on the personality of Satan and his agency in seducing men into error and sin. The difficulties connected with Christian experience, and the devices of the great adversary are forcibly presented. It is written in a clear, fresh and pointed style, and, without endorsing every sentiment which the book contains, we believe it will be read with profit.

*The Rebellion Record.* No. 42 of this valuable Serial has just been published and brings down the documentary history of the War till September, 1863. It contains engraved portraits of Gen. Longstreet and Gen. Washburne.

*The North American Review* has entered upon its fifty-first year and yet retains all the vigor and freshness of its early years. It is one of the ablest Quarterlies published in the English language. Dr. Peabody in its editorial chair has been succeeded by Professors Lowell and Norton.

*Harper's Monthly Magazine.* The July number of this excellent Magazine has promptly come to hand and is filled with interesting matter, among which is a valuable paper connected with the War of 1812.

*Littell's Living Age.* We take pleasure in commending to our readers this publication, issued weekly at Boston. It selects the best articles in every department of literature from various Foreign Magazines, many of which are inaccessible to most American readers.

*Thanksgiving Sermon,* delivered in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Hagerstown, Md., August 6th, 1863. By Rev. J. Evans. Gettysburg: H. C. Neinstedt. 1864.

*Historical Sketch of the Harrisburg Bible Society,* from the date of its organization to the celebration of the fiftieth Anniversary, February 17th, 1864. Prepared at the request of the Board of Managers by Charles A. Hay, D. D. Harrisburg: T. F. Scheffer. 1864.



## CONTENTS OF NO. LX.

Article.	Page
<p>I. THE WISDOM OF THE WORLD, AND OF THE CHURCH            COMPARED, .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By F. W. CONRAD, D. D., Chambersburg, Pa.</p>	<p>151</p>
<p>II. INSTRUCTION IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE ACCORD-            ING TO THE SYSTEM OF THE EVANGELICAL            LUTHERAN CHURCH.—BY JOHN HENRY KURTZ,            D. D., .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By REV. EDWARD J. KOONS, A. M., Brooklyn, N. Y.</p>	<p>485</p>
<p>III. THE STUDY OF THE ANCIENT CLASSICS, .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By CHARLES SHORT, A. M., President of Kenyon College.</p>	<p>498</p>
<p>IV. THE GERMAN LANGUAGE, .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. J. W. NEVIN, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.</p>	<p>515</p>
<p>V. REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MIN-            ISTERS, .....</p>	<p>531</p>
<p>VI. PRECIOUS STONES, .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER, D. D., Philadelphia.</p>	<p>541</p>
<p>VII. THE LORD'S SUPPER, .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. F. A. MUHLENBERG, A. M., of Pennsylvania College.</p>	<p>549</p>
<p>VIII. CATECHISATION, .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. THOMAS LAPE, A. M., Malden, N. Y.</p>	<p>559</p>
<p>IX. THE MYSTICAL UNION, .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. C. P. KRAUTH, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.</p>	<p>564</p>
<p>X. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN, .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By GEORGE C. MAUND, A. M., Baltimore, Md.</p>	<p>579</p>
<p>XI. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS, .....</p>	<p>585</p>

The July number of this *Quarterly* presents the following table of contents: I. Sacramental Meditations, translated from the German of Dr. Ernst Sartorius, by Rev. G. A. Wenzel, A. M., Philadelphia; II. Universities, translated from the German of Dr. Tholuck, by Rev. F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M., of Pennsylvania College; III. Mistakes of Educated Men, by S. Austin Allibone, LL. D., Philadelphia; IV. Our General Synod; V. Questions relating to the Lord's Prayer, translated from the German of Dr. F. Dehusch, by Rev. G. F. Kretel A. M., Philadelphia; VI. The Literature of the Lutheran Church in the United States, by J. G. Morris, D. D., Baltimore; VII. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers; VIII. Remarks on the Meaning of Baptizo, in the New Testament, by E. Greenwald, Easton, Pa.; IX. Notices of New Publications. This is a very interesting bill of fare, and those who sit down with the expectation of enjoying a rich intellectual feast in perusing this number of the *Review* will not be disappointed. The first article alone is worth the price charged for the whole.—*Luth. Standard*.

The July number of this *Quarterly*, edited by Professor Stoecker, Gettysburg, Pa., is at hand. Besides the usual notices of new Publications, it contains eight articles on as many different subjects. Three of them, very able and interesting, are translations from the German. The work is well edited and does honor to the Church, by which it is sustained.—*German Reformed Messenger*.

The articles are generally able, those on "Universities" and "Mistakes of Educated Men," are of special interest. All interested in the *status* and progress of the Lutheran Church in this country, will find instruction and profit in the articles on its Literature, and its Deceased Ministers.—*The Evangelist*.

The July number of this staunch *Review* comes with its accustomed promptness, and is full of interesting matter.—*Sunday School Times*.

Dr. Allibone's review of Hart's Address on "The Mistakes of Education," is a most interesting article. The article, "Our General Synod," is valuable for its fulness and clearness, and accuracy of detail. Dr. Greenwald is plain, sensible, straight-forward, in his usual vein.—*Lutheran Observer*.

In the combination of scholarly thoroughness, timeliness, readability and variety, it is one of the best numbers ever issued. Most of the articles comprise the various qualities enumerated in the different measures natural to their themes, though each has some predominating element.—*Lutheran & Missionary*.

The Evangelical Quarterly Review comes to us promptly from Gettysburg, freighted, as usual, with good things, among which, an Essay by S. Austin Allibone, on the "Mistakes of Educated Men," and the "Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers," by our friend, the Editor, have interested us much.—*Congregationalist*.

The July number of this valuable publication, edited by Professor Stoecker, of Pennsylvania College, is on our table. All the articles are interesting and instructive. The *Review* is one of the best publications of the Lutheran Church, and has special claims upon the people of that faith.—*Star & Banner*.

THE  
EVANGELICAL  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LX.

OCTOBER, 1864.

ARTICLE I.

THE WISDOM OF THE WORLD, AND OF THE CHURCH  
COMPARED.

By F. W. CONRAD, D. D., Chambersburg, Pa.

TRUTH is sometimes elicited by direct inspection, and at other times by contrast and comparison. The latter is the mode in which the Son of God elicited the truth enunciated in the conclusion of the parable of the unjust steward; that "The children of this world, are in their generation, wiser than the children of light." Wisdom, in its metaphysical sense, consists in the choice of ends and the means of attaining them. In this sense, neither the character of the end nor that of the means, is taken into account in a moral point of view at all. The choice of any end and of the means of securing it, constitutes wisdom. As such it is often used as the synonym of prudence, which consists in the anticipation of evils, and the exercise of a sound judgment, in avoiding them. And this was the kind of wisdom manifested by the unjust steward. He had defrauded his lord, was detected, called to account, and threatened with displacement. In this emergency, he forecast his future condition, and makes provision for his subsequent wants. Starvation and beg-

ary stared him in the face, and prompted by the love of self-being, and a lingering sense of personal self-respect, he devises and adopts a plan for avoiding both these evils. Accordingly, he defrauds still further his lord, and favors his tenants, in order that, when he should be driven from his position by the justice of the former, he might be received and sustained by the gratitude of the latter. And by so doing he acted wisely, notwithstanding the fact that he acted wrongly. Hence the wisdom thus exhibited, is declared in the Scriptures to be of "a worldly sort," and represented by the Saviour, as characteristic of the children of this world. In the moral sense, wisdom consists in the choice of the best ends, and of the best means for attaining them. To manifest such wisdom, it becomes indispensable, that the ends selected be morally good, and the means adopted ethically right. This kind of wisdom, is said to be "from above," and characterizes the children of light. Comparing ends with ends and means with means, as distinguishing the wisdom of the children of this world, from that of the children of light, the conclusion would be, that the wisdom of the latter is superior to that of the former; but contrasting the manner in which the children of this world pursue their ends, and adapt the means to their attainment, with the manner in which the children of light pursue their ends, and adapt the means to their attainment, the wisdom of the former; is determined to be superior to that of the latter. The Saviour does not say, that it ought to be so, nor that it must remain so, but simply that in general it was so. And in the consideration of the evidences, establishing this truth, drawn from a comparison of the wisdom of the children of this world, with that of the children of light, we invite the candid attention of the reader.

*I. It is a characteristic of wisdom, that between the degree of effort put forth, and the value of the end to be attained, there must be a real correspondence.*

The children of this world, as human beings, are all subject to want. The consciousness of want, awakens longing, and this prompts the effort to secure the objects which will relieve it. In this manner, the children of this world show that they possess the capacity for the selection and attainment of mechanical, sensuous, rational and ethical ends. And they are all so constituted, that each must have, and must select some ultimate end, to which all others will be regarded as subordinate, and to the attainment of which they

will be subjected and used as means. And what is the ultimate end of the children of this world? Sensuous enjoyment, *i. e.*, happiness derived from the gratification of the senses. This constitutes their chief good. The means which will secure it are the objects of this world. And inasmuch as they regard its attainment as the supreme achievement of life, they make corresponding efforts to secure it, in the highest degree. And in this correspondence between their efforts and their end, lies their wisdom. But as reason is higher than sense, and as moral excellency is more precious than happiness, so too, are rational and ethical ends superior to sensuous ones; and yet the children of this world put forth their greatest efforts, to promote their sensuous, and neglect those which would advance their rational and ethical ends. And in the degree of effort which they thus put forth, we discover the true estimate which they place upon the value of the end for which they live, and as there is a real correspondence between them, they thus exhibit in their conduct an important characteristic of wisdom.

The children of light are created by the same God, and subject to the same wants. The consciousness of their wants causes the same longing for relief, and this longing prompts them to make efforts to secure it. Thus far there is a constitutional identity between them. But the former have been brought under the light of truth, and transformed under the light of the Holy Spirit, and hence they have become the children of light. As such, they rise to a higher sphere of existence, and are capacitated to apprehend spiritual realities, to choose spiritual ends, and to put forth corresponding efforts to secure them. Their ultimate end is the Glory of God, as embraced in the justification, sanctification and salvation, of sinful, depraved and ruined man. Now, in order that they may manifest the same degree of wisdom, in promoting their supreme end, as the children of this world do in promoting theirs, it becomes necessary that there should be the same correspondence between the degree of effort put forth by them to attain it, and its real value. But when we consider the fact, that the children of light acknowledge their obligation to glorify God in their bodies and spirits which are his; and that the value of the moral recovery and eternal blessedness of a ruined world, surpasses all finite conception; and then compare the degree of effort which they put forth to promote these ends, we become painfully impressed with the fact, that there is no real corre-



spondence between them, and hence they are said "to come short of the Glory of God." And as we have seen that such a correspondence does exist between the value of the end of the children of this world, and the degree of effort which they put forth to secure it, it follows that the wisdom thus manifested by them, is superior to that manifested by the children of light.

II. *It is another characteristic of wisdom, to make efforts for the attainment of an end, at the most propitious period.* Wherever the children of this world appear upon the stage of life, their constitutional wants are immediately felt. As physical beings, they need food, clothing and shelter. As social beings, they require homes, and provision for their families. As political beings, they are in want of security in their persons and protection in the exercise of their rights. As intellectual beings, they must have mental culture. And as civilized beings, their interests demand opportunity for prosecuting a calling, developing resources, and making improvements. Now what constitutes the propitious time, for making the necessary efforts to supply these necessities, and secure these advantages? The earliest possible period which ability and capacity will warrant. Tested by this criterion, the children of this world have manifested a commendable degree of wisdom, in all civilized lands, and in none more so, than in the United States of America. Whether we fix our eyes upon them as citizens of our whole country, or as pioneers in its Western section, or as inhabitants of its towns and cities, we shall observe numerous and striking evidences of their wisdom, in putting forth timely efforts for the supply of all their natural wants. To procure the necessities of life, they devote themselves at once to their various callings—to secure the comforts of home, they prosecute industrial pursuits—to enjoy life, liberty and the uninterrupted pursuit of happiness, they found governments, to exercise authority, frame constitutions, enact laws, administer justice, punish crime, and thus promote the general good—to attain intellectual culture, they establish Common Schools to disseminate education in its lower, and Colleges and Seminaries, to impart it in its higher forms—to stimulate mind, they provide and disseminate a periodic and permanent literature, and thus realize the blessings of the highest civilization.

But how does the wisdom of the children of light compare with that of the children of this world, as just presented?

We answer, unfavorably in a high degree. The end to which they have professedly devoted their lives, is as we have already seen, the glory of God, in the conversion of the world to Jesus Christ. The principal means necessary to the attainment of their end, are the Christian Sanctuary, the Christian Ministry, Christian Literature and Christian Education. And what does the characteristic of wisdom under consideration require? That the children of light should furnish these agencies and instrumentalities, at the earliest period, required by the wants of mankind, and rendered possible by their ability and prosperity. But that they have been deficient in this respect to a lamentable degree in general, is evident from the history of Christianity, and that the Lutheran Churches in the United States have fallen comparatively low in the scale of wisdom, in which we are now weighing them, the destitution, and character of many of their members abundantly prove.

Take the Christian Sanctuary! This constitutes the modern Sinai, whence the law of man's highest well-being goes forth—the New Testament Calvary, whence Christ and him crucified are proclaimed as the recovering power of a fallen world. Wherever the members of our household of faith are found, its presence is needed, and wherever the ability exists to aid them in erecting it, the obligation to do so is imposed upon every one bound to them by a common faith, and favored by the enjoyment of its worship and instructions. But how little has this obligation been felt, and in how few cases has it been met? The rule with us has been to anticipate nothing, and to do but little for the thousands of our people emigrating from Europe and the East to the Great West. Our Church Extension movement was comparatively small, and altogether inadequate to render the required aid to a tithe of those bands of Lutherans, who needed it all over the broad West. We usually shut our eyes when Christ has commanded us to open them, and hence do not see scores and hundreds of rich harvest fields, perishing for the lack of the house of the Lord, with its necessary concomitants. Instead of becoming religious pioneers, occupying ground early, and reaping first fruits, we have too often been guilty of neglecting all these advantages, and of allowing wiser children of light to reap them; and when almost every prominent denomination was already represented in a town, city, or neighborhood, then we have been wont to come along, and endeavor to gather up the remnants left.

organize them into a Church, and aid them in erecting a house of worship. We need but mention Chicago and San Francisco, to awaken the painful conviction, that we have not heretofore, nor are we now, manifesting that wisdom, which requires that the Sanctuary of God be planted in the midst of our destitute people, at the earliest period rendered possible by our ability.

Take the Christian Ministry! This constitutes the soul of the sanctuary, — the living oracle proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ. It is indispensable to the complete organization and continued progress of the Church. The word it declares, becomes the power of God unto salvation. It is necessary for all men, and those possessing it, are bound to furnish it to those destitute of it, whether in heathen or civilized lands, at the earliest possible period. To do this is true wisdom. Have we manifested it as a Church? Not in any very high degree. We have not as a denomination furnished a due proportion of Missionaries to the heathen, and we have not provided Home Missionaries at the most propitious time, to our scattered members in different portions of our land. In what city, town, or neighborhood, where we now have a minister laboring in the West, was nothing lost by delay? Where cannot influential persons be pointed out, who pertained to us, but who united with other denominations, before the Lutheran banner was unfurled in their midst? And in what prominent place in the entire West, could not a Lutheran Missionary have found members enough to have formed the nucleus of a congregation, years ago? We know of none, and have heard of none. But we have visited many places, where we saw and heard enough to convince us, that openings of the most promising character existed, for building up large and influential Lutheran congregations.

Take Christian Literature! This constitutes the crystallization of thought, the daguerreotype of speech, the inscription of the pen, the embodiment of truth, the amplification of the Scriptures, the multiplication and permanent preservation of the spiritual productions of the Church, the resurrection and immortality of her ministry, her achievements, and her ages. The sanctuary may be erected, the ministry occupy it, and thus multitudes be brought under the influence of the preached word. But this agency is limited to times, places, persons and circumstances, creating the necessity for the origination of an instrumentality, which

shall be unlimited in all these respects. These conditions are fulfilled in religious literature. It is adapted to reach all persons, to pervade all times, to appear in all places, and to exert its influence under all circumstances. It is an invaluable sauxiliary to the anctuary and the ministry, and an almost indispensable requisite to the efficiency, progress, and triumph of the Church. Wisdom demands that it be furnished at the earliest possible period. Have the children of light been, everywhere and at all times, actuated by it? In a very limited degree. Have we as a Protestant Church been an exception? In our early history, our reformation period, we might perhaps justly claim it. But what shall we say of the wisdom of our Church in her American period? She has been slow in importing her transatlantic literary works, tardy in translating her German productions, and very late in providing an Americo-Lutheran literature. For more than fifty years, she had no weekly religious periodical; for more than seventy years she had no Quarterly Review; and for more than a hundred years, she organized no Lutheran Board of Publication.

Take Christian Institutions of Learning! These are the original sources of Christian education, both in its higher and lower form. They prepare the teachers of the schools, where the children of the Church are taught; they educate the ministry for her sanctuaries; and they discipline the minds of the authors, who produce her literature. Though mentioned last, in importance, they deserve to be placed first. Their presence or absence determines the planting and training of the Church; their number and character, conditions her extent and position in the earth. What does wisdom require concerning them? That their foundations be laid simultaneous with those of the Church. Have the children of light everywhere and at all times been actuated by it? By no means. How does the course of the Lutheran Church in America appear under this test? The immigration of her members to this country, began an hundred and twenty years ago, increasing from scores and hundreds to thousands and tens of thousands. And yet, three quarters of a century passed away, before she began to found Colleges and Theological Seminaries, and more than a century elapsed, before she established a single institution, for the thorough education of her daughters and mothers. The most charitable thing we can say of her is: "Better late, than never!" But palliatives we have none to offer, and



mollifying ointment for the wounds opened by the arrows of truth shot from the bow of history, we have no disposition either to manufacture, or administer. The comparison between the course pursued by the children of this world, and that of the children of light, is prejudicial to the latter, and the wisdom of the one, still appears superior to that manifested by the other.

III. *It is another characteristic of wisdom, that the means be adequate to the attainment of the end.* The children of this world, under the pressure of various wants, are impelled, not only to make timely but also adequate provision for their supply. Accordingly, we behold them devoting themselves to ordinary labor, the mechanic arts, agriculture, commerce, merchandize, manufactures, learned professions, science and art, in sufficient numbers to supply all their animal and rational wants. They open thorough fares, dig canals, construct rail roads, multiply inventions, and build manufactories, adequate to develop the natural resources of the land, to add increased value by intelligent labor to the raw material, and to transport their products, cheaply and rapidly to the best markets. They build school houses, establish teachers, seminaries, and found universities in every portion of the country, affording the facilities of education for the more common walks of life, as well as for the higher culture, demanded by the professions of Law and Medicine, Literature and Politics. They ordain town and city corporations, township and county regulations, and State and National Governments, clothed with sufficient authority to keep the peace, defend the State, and promote the public welfare. And they erect Alms Houses, Hospitals and Asylums, capable of supplying the necessities of the poor, the rich, and the unfortunate. These provisions, in their character, numbers and extent, are adequate to supply most, if not all the earthly wants of the children of this world. In this manner they promote their sensuous happiness, attain their ultimate end in a high degree, and exhibit their wisdom in one of its most favorable aspects.

Let us still further compare the wisdom of the children of light, with the characteristic of that of the children of this world, just exhibited. They are commanded to preach the Gospel to every creature. They have voluntarily made the conversion of the world the ultimate end of life. Are the means originated and used by them, adequate, even approximately, to its attainment? Look out upon the moral con-



dition of the world for the answer ! Eight hundred millions of immortal souls have never seen a Christian sanctuary, heard a Christian minister, received a Christian education, read a Christian book, or heard of the existence of the Bible. In nominally Christian lands, the provisions of the Church are hardly adequate to supply the religious wants of one-half of the population. Even in Germany, England and America, fields of crying destitution, vast in extent, everywhere appear.

The inadequacy of the religious provision of the Lutheran Church in the United States, is perhaps greater than that of any other denomination. We have built 2500 Churches, but we need 2500 more. We have furnished 1600 Ministers, but we need 1600 more. We have produced some periodical and permanent literature, but we need it multiplied ten-fold more. We have laid the foundations of 14 literary and theological institutions, but not one of them is yet fully endowed, the majority of them have only been begotten, are in embryo awaiting strength to be born, while others are gasping for the breath of life, and are ready to die. We have established 14 academies, while under proper restrictions and management, our wants would require many more. We opened half a dozen female seminaries, but scarcely half of them still live, to foster as *Alma Maters*, the daughters of Zion. We are educating 150 beneficiaries, but we ought to be training quadruple as many more. We have gathered into our higher institutions perhaps a thousand young men, and at most a few hundred young women, but our wants require, that their advantages should be shared by thousands more. We are supporting perhaps a hundred home and half a score of foreign Missionaries, but our ability would enable us to double the number of the former, and quintuple that of the latter. We have called into existence half a dozen institutions, for the manifestation of charity and mercy to the widow and orphan, the sick, the infirm, and the unfortunate, but the sufferings of the Church, poor, bereft, and afflicted, cry out in thunder tones for the establishment of many more. What is the conclusion then, thus forced upon those who have accompanied us in our tour of observation ? Can it be any other than that the means used by the children of this world in the attainment of their end, excel in adequacy, those used by the children of light, in the attainment of

their's, and that, consequently, the wisdom manifested by the former, is superior to that exhibited by the latter?

IV. *It is another characteristic of wisdom, that the reward of labor be bestowed according to its nature and value.* To secure the individual and associated ends of the children of this world, it becomes necessary, that a sufficient number of persons acquire the proper qualifications, and enter upon the various callings and professions of human life. In order to secure their services, adequate inducements must be held out to them, in the form of official honor and pecuniary reward. And as the nature of these vocations differ, so too does the character of the qualifications required, and of the services rendered, and hence the amount of emolument bestowed, must be regulated accordingly. This is not only called for by the dictates of justice, but it is enforced by the lessons of practical wisdom. The children of this world have exhibited it in a sufficient degree, to secure an adequate number of properly qualified laborers, mechanics, farmers, merchants, bankers, lawyers, doctors, teachers, editors, professors, military officers, soldiers, sailors, legislators, judges and executives, to develop the national resources, improve the national domain, administer the national affairs, and advance the national greatness. In other words, the rewards of labor and the emoluments of office, have been sufficiently great, to crowd almost every secular calling and profession in the land.

The children of light have theoretically adopted the same principle of wisdom, but they have proven greatly deficient, in its practical application. To originate and apply the means necessary for the moral recovery of man, it becomes indispensable that certain vocations and professions be filled, by an adequate number of properly qualified persons. And although devoted to spiritual interest, the principal, that "the laborer is worthy of his hire," must be honestly carried out, in order to secure their services. To what extent, this has been done by the children of light, the amount of remuneration paid for literary and ecclesiastical services will show.

We have seen that they need Christian literature. This constitutes the highest kind of labor, demands the highest qualifications, and hence, ought to receive the highest reward. But in this, as well as in many other cases, that which ought to be, is not that which is. Hardly a man, if devoted to the preparation and publication of religious books, could secure a competency from it, and few of those filling

editorial chairs, receive an adequate support. Church literature must, therefore, be produced by those who are supported from other sources, and the time and strength devoted to it, can only be that which may be spared, from the prosecution of other pursuits. And while this continues it must remain depreciated in quality, and inadequate in quantity.

To foster Christian education, and prepare Pastors and Missionaries, the Church needs learned Professors to man her insitutions. The preparation required, and the work exacted must, likewise, be of the highest order, and hence should receive a liberal reward. But this is far from being generally the case. A Principal in a High School in Boston receives \$2500, which is more than all the Professors in some of our institutions receive together, and a clerk or salesman in some of our large cities, receives more than twice as much salary as any Professor or President in any of our Colleges or Seminaries.

To fill her pulpits, the Church requires an adequate number of educated and pious Ministers. And as they are commanded to give themselves wholly to their work, it follows that they must be supported entirely by their work. And as their attainments and labors are of the highest order, so too should their compensation be. But what are the facts in regard to ministerial support. They prove that the principles of wisdom and justice under consideration, are everywhere violated. There is no other profession requiring any thing like such qualifications and such services, which is not more than twice as well supported. A paragraph went the rounds of the papers not long ago, stating the number of Lawyers in the United States, and mentioning the fact, that the average of their salaries amounted to \$1500 per annum. Another followed not long afterwards giving the number of Ministers, and putting the average of their salaries at \$300. So that while the pecuniary reward of the one is five times as great as that of the other profession, the qualifications and services of the latter are superior to those of the former. And what are the consequences of this injustice and folly? It prevents the command of Christ from being heeded by many who are called to the Ministry. It deters multitudes from studying Theology, who began their College course with that intention. It causes not a few to bury their ministerial talent, even after they have been educated, by not entering upon the work of their holy calling. It has so discouraged a host of laborers in God's vineyard, as to necessi-

tate them to abandon it, and devote themselves against all their inclinations and preferences, to some secular calling. It produces an unsettled state of the churches, and severs the pastoral tie so frequently, as greatly to retard their progress. It renders the life of the Ministry so onerous, and subjects them to such self-denials as greatly to retard their usefulness. And as the clerical profession is thus held up before the minds of parents and sons, as one involving want and suffering during its prosecution, and the gloomy prospect for the occupancy of an alms house at its end, it is not at all to be wondered at, that many of the former refuse to dedicate their son to such a calling, and many of the latter, shrink even from contemplating the duty of entering upon it.

To do that, which in its legitimate influence tends to weaken our literature, cripple our institutions, and reduce the number of our Ministry, cannot be wise; and as this is the direct and constant result, flowing from the inadequate rewards bestowed upon literary, educational and ministerial labor, by the children of light, they may justly be charged with folly. And as in this respect, the children of this world act differently, it follows that the wisdom which they exhibit, is superior to that manifested by the children of light.

V. *It is another characteristic of wisdom to harmonize the principles of division and concentration in the attainment of individual and associated ends.* The children of this world inhabiting our country, shall constitute the representatives of all the rest. They are divided into individuals, families and communities, and yet united as one nation. They occupy houses, dwell in towns and cities, inhabit townships, counties and States, and yet are all citizens of the United States. As such they have local and general interests to promote — individual and associated ends to attain. And they manifest their wisdom by securing the harmonious development of the principles of division of labor, and concentration of effort in attaining them. Individuals, as divided from others, are permitted to promote their personal ends, but not as if in isolation from them, in such a manner as to interfere with the same ends of their fellows; but as united to them, in such a manner as to harmonize with them in the attainment of their ends. Accordingly, we find individuals and families dwelling in towns and cities, dividing their efforts in the promotion of their individual and domestic ends, and yet concentrating them harmoniously in the



promotion of their municipal ends—the inhabitants of towns and cities dividing and concentrating their efforts in the same manner in securing their municipal and their township and county ends—and the citizens of townships and counties doing the same thing in furthering their state and national ends. To secure such a development of the productive energy of the people, is the object of local governments, acting in unison with, and subordination to the general government. The manner in which all this is to be done is laid down in Constitutions and Statutes, and the motives calculated to secure it, are found in the sanctions of law. By the manifestation of this aspect of wisdom, their individual and common interests are not only secured, but they are promoted in the most economical, expeditious and successful manner.

The children of light occupying the same country, shall likewise constitute the representatives of all the rest. Has the characteristic of wisdom, just illustrated in the conduct of the children of this world, actuated them? In a very low degree. They are divided even as Protestants, into a score of denominations, and thousands of congregations. And instead of developing their religious energies harmoniously in the attainment of what they acknowledge to be their common end—the conversion of the world for the Glory of God—they do so antagonistically. Brother is isolated from brother, altar stands over against altar, congregation interferes with congregation, and denomination is pitted against denomination. Thus vast energies are misdirected, countless treasures are squandered, and mighty influences for good are lost, because half the talents of Zion are diverted and buried. More sanctuaries are thus built than the spiritual wants of localities require—more Ministers are supported than communities need—more institutions are founded than the literary and theological necessities of the Church call for,—and thousands at home, and millions in foreign lands perish, because the means thus wasted, were not appropriated to them.

What would our judgment be, if the children of this world were to act, even in a small degree, in this manner? We should condemn it with one voice, and protest against it as the height of folly. Suppose that the various nationalities, occupying our territory were to be so divided in sentiment, and so isolated in action, that each would insist on having its own local and state government—its own schools and Colleges—its own public improvements—all manned by its own citizens and supported by its own funds—and each jeal-



ous of the other and antagonistic to all. What a turtle pace this would give to all progress—what a pigmy character it would stamp upon all their institutions — what a tax ridden people they would become — what a self-devouring nation they would be—what an insignificant power they would constitute among the nations of the earth !

We, as a denomination in America, constitute an illustration of the lack of this aspect of wisdom. We are divided into German, Swedish, Norwegian and English Lutherans—into Missouri, Wisconsin, Ohio, Buffalo, General and some other Synods. The same nationalities and tongues are divided into different ecclesiastical bodies on the same territory, district Synods are divided from each other in the same General Synod—congregations in the same district Synod, and town, and individuals even in the same Church. Instead of concentrating our energies and harmonizing our efforts, we isolate and antagonize them. In many towns and neighborhoods especially in the West, and in not a few even in the East, there are two and three different kinds of Lutheran churches built, and as many kinds of Lutheran Ministers laboring, where the number of our people require but one. With institutions it is the same. Buffalo, St. Louis, the Springfields, Columbus, Decorah, Wartburg and Selinsgrove are the seats of at least half a dozen Lutheran institutions, characterized by divergent theological tendencies, and the climax is about to be capped, by arraying Philadelphia against Gettysburg. With Church periodicals it is the same. The Informatorium exposes the un-Lutheranism of the Lutheraner, the Lutheraner of the Kirchenzeitung, the Kirchenzeitung and Zeitschrift of the Kirchenbote, and the Standard and the Lutheran of the Lutheran Observer ; with unrestricted liberty for a cross fire whenever the disposition is felt, or the opportunity occurs. In our immense losses, our unoccupied church-fields, our large pastoral districts, our scarcity of beneficiaries, our insufficiency of missionaries, our struggling institutions, our small benevolent contributions, our circumscribed church-literature, our deficiencies in piety, and our weakness as a religious power in the land, we see the legitimate and inevitable results of this division of effort in antagonistic development, instead of harmonious co-operation in the attainment of our denominational ends.

The fac-simile of this picture it is easy to paint. Suppose that the children of this world, inhabiting the same locality, were to permit their differences of opinion, in regard to the

best mode of making a certain improvement, or of using it afterwards, so to divide them, that they would not only not co-operate in its construction, but refuse to avail themselves of its advantages, and stubbornly go to work and construct a rival one, for their exclusive accommodation. Let it be a rail road between two points. They differ about the course it is to run, the width of the track, the character of the rails, the kind of locomotives, the election of officers and the management of the road. The various questions are decided by the majority, but the minority, in their pride of opinion, refuse to submit to the decision, and in the exercise of private judgment, they determine neither to take stock nor to patronize the road. What! says one of these sticklers: shall I subscribe my money for a road running by disputed point? Shall I consent to risk my life on a six-foot track? Shall I trust my freight to the cohesive power of a T rail? Shall I consent to ride after a camel back locomotive fed by anthracite coal and running 25 miles an hour? Shall I trust my business interests to the management of a progressive American rail road president, with a board of managers infected with the same radical notions? Never: I would rather carry my freight on a canal boat, and travel in a stage-coach. I go for forming a company to build another road. His motion is sustained, and the road put into operation as a rival. This is no caricature, but a reflecting mirror in which we may behold the divided state into which extreme symbolism, confessional hair-splitting, theological speculation, and exegetical dogmatism on the one hand; and lawless individualism, the unrestricted exercise of private judgment, involving ecclesiastical anarchy and radicalism, on the other hand, have brought the American Lutheran Church. For, it is demonstrable, that the doctrinal and practical differences, prevailing among the various nationalities and the separated Synods of the Lutheran household of faith in the United States, have reference, with rare exceptions, to the mere accidents and not to the great essential features of the Christian system of truth. To remain, therefore, in isolation from each other, and to continue the process of Church-disintegration still further, will involve not only the folly of acting in violation of the dictate of wisdom just considered, but likewise the guilt of ecclesiastical schism and heresy. In other words, it will establish the fact, that they have permitted their differences of theological opinion and practice, to alienate their hearts, and to develop their Church life, in

the form of separatistic and opposing factions, rather than in that of one great, united and organic body, concentrating all its energies harmoniously, in the furtherance of its important mission on earth, and the attainment of its all-glorious end in heaven. And as the children of this world, are very seldom guilty of such folly, and the children of light very frequently are, it follows still, that the wisdom of the former is superior to that of the latter.

VI. *It is another characteristic of wisdom, to apportion the means necessary to an end, according to the ability of those obligated to contribute towards its attainment.* The children of this world need, as we have already seen, governments, institutions of learning and public improvements, to promote their common interests and minister to their earthly happiness. To provide them, requires large sums of money, and as all the citizens are privileged to share their benefits, so too, are all obligated to contribute to their support. But as the citizens differ in the degree of their wealth, justice requires that their aid correspond with it, and hence each is bound to pay towards them, according to his ability. Hence, after the aggregate amount of expenditure has been determined, it is apportioned among all the citizens in such sums, as the assessed value of their property calls for. The public burdens are thus parcelled out equally, and each one is obligated to bear a just share of them.

The children of light, as we have also seen, need various agencies and instrumentalities to secure their religious ends. To establish and foster them, requires the outlay of large sums of money, and this must be contributed by all associated with them. What is the dictate of wisdom in regard to the principle, according to which it ought to be done? Unquestionably, that the amounts required should be proportioned to the ability of each. And what is thus determined by the judgment of the understanding, is both formally and informally enjoined by the sacred Scriptures. In the Old Testament dispensation, the prescribed proportion for the temple service, was one-tenth, leaving room for the play of voluntary offerings, according to the degree of gratitude and sense of obligation felt. Nor has this principle been repealed in the New Testament dispensation, and the principle of religious anarchy introduced, leaving each one in the exercise of full liberty to give or not to give — to give as little or as much, as his whims and impulses might prompt, without being under any obligation, to regulate his benevolent contributions,

by the just and equal standard, adopted and promulgated by the authority of God? No. The children of light are declared to be stewards of God; they are commanded to give as God has prospered them—to contribute according to their ability—and to sow bountifully, cheerfully and constantly. They are warned against repudiating this principle, thereby easing themselves and burdening their brethren, and threatened with the curse of spiritual barrenness, for shutting their bowels of compassion and sowing sparingly of their abundance, towards the relief of the poor and unfortunate. This principle still stands, as the law of Christian benevolence, unrepealed and irrevocable; binding when first uttered, binding now, and binding through all time, upon the children of light.

Is it asked whether the precise proportion is fixed in the New Testament dispensation? We answer, in the eye of God it is. As he grants to each his ability and prosperity, he knows precisely what proportion would meet his obligations, as imposed by the graduation principle ordained by himself. The New Testament benevolent proportion is, therefore, just as fixed and certain in the eyes of God, as that of the Old was, and the obligation resting upon each to be governed by it, is just as strong. In the eye of man, however, while the principle is fixed, the proportion is not formally declared, but must be determined by the extent of Church wants, and the peculiarity of individual circumstances. Thus in building a Church, supporting a Pastor, founding an institution, the aggregate amount required for the accomplishment of each, apportioned respectively among all properly interested in it, according to their several ability, would determine the proportion due in the eye of God from each. And while we shall not attempt to decide the exact amount which each church-steward is in arrears to his Lord, according to the proportion which he has enjoined upon him, we shall nevertheless maintain, that the New Testament proportion, which each one ought to give to the cause of God and humanity in general, cannot be less than that formally imposed in the Old. And this opinion we base upon the contrast between them. The old dispensation was imperfect and transient—the new is perfect and everlasting. In the old the wants of the Church were confined mainly to one nation—in the new, they include those of all nations. In the old, the proportion was one tenth, with permission to transcend it—in the



new, the principle of graduating benevolence is inculcated in such terms, that the primitive Christians went far beyond it, and instead of falling under censure for their extraordinary disinterestedness, they became the subjects of inspired commendation, and their example held up for the admiration and imitation of all pertaining to it. In the old, the religious wants of Israel were mainly confined to the support of the temple service, and yet for this one-tenth was imposed—in the new, the religious wants of the children of light are greatly extended and multiplied, beyond those centering in the house of God. From all of which, it is impossible to conclude otherwise, than that the New Testament proportion of benevolence required, cannot fall below, but must rise above, that revealed in the Old.

But how is this law of graduating benevolence, according to ability and the wants of the Church and the world, to be enforced? Not by the strong arm of the State, as is the case to some extent in Europe; because the alliance between it and the Church, is itself unholy; and because voluntariness, the true characteristic of benevolence, would be destroyed thereby. Not by the disciplinary power entrusted to the Church, where she is independent of the State; for, while she has the right to adopt the principle of benevolence, for which we are contending, as one of her rules and regulations, and to obligate her members to be governed by it, in their contributions to the cause of God; and while there may be cases of such a flagrant violation thereof, as to call for the exercise of her authority in enforcing it, nevertheless in general, it would be inexpedient and might prove injurious, to extort charitable funds, by the arm of discipline. How then must this law be enforced? By the power of conscience. This is the arbiter to whom the Church appeals. This is the arm of power, to which she looks for the enforcement of her claims. A conscience instructed in the word, and enlightened by the Spirit of God—a conscience which has looked through the telescope of eternity, and learned the relative value of earthly and heavenly things—a conscience, which at the command of Christ, has opened its eyes, and looked over the field of the world, beginning at its own Jerusalem, and extending its own observations to the ends of the earth, computing the extent and value of the harvest which is ready to perish, and estimating honestly its own ability to aid in saving it. To such a conscience, the Church looks as her only



hope, in securing the means necessary to supply the wants of the world.

But that such a state of conscience has not generally existed among the children of light in past ages : and that the same is still true of them, to a very lamentable extent, the moral condition of the world from the advent of Christ until now attests. And that we as a Church among Protestants, and as a denomination in America, have not attained to any very elevated standard of benevolent action, our past history and present deficiencies prove. Theoretically we have acknowledged, and formally we have adopted the principle of graduating our contributions, according to our ability and wants : but practically we have neither honored nor enforced it. Who can doubt, that if the contrary had been the case, and the law of benevolence re-enacted by Christ, and enforced by the teaching of the Apostles, and the example of the primitive Christians, had been obeyed by the Lutheran Church in the United States, that her numbers would have been quadrupled, and her relative denominational position changed, from the third or fourth to the very first. But letting bygones be bygones, if she could be brought even now to arouse from her lethargy, and voluntarily to carry out the Scriptural principle we are enforcing, she might bound forward so rapidly, as very soon to outstrip every competitor in the American amphitheatre of Zion. And who can question, that if all the children of light, had been governed by the principle of graduating their benevolence by their ability and the wants of mankind, in the same manner and to the same degree as the children of this world have been, in the sphere of civilization, that they would not ages ago, have brought all nations under the influence of the Gospel? And as the children of this world have greatly surpassed them in this respect, it follows still that the wisdom manifested by the former, is superior to that manifested by the latter.

VII. *It is another characteristic of wisdom, that special means be adapted to the attainment of special ends.* We have seen how the children of this world manifest their wisdom, by adapting ordinary means to the attainment of their ordinary ends. In their social development, however, as communities and sections, wants of an extraordinary character arise, and for the supply of these the ordinary means in use among them, are found to be inadequate. This becomes the occasion for the origination of extraordinary means to meet such emergencies. Accordingly, when individual enterprise,

and State provision fail, associated enterprise, as organized into incorporated companies, makes up all these deficiencies. In this manner the skill, wealth, and energy of the nation, are concentrated upon various public improvements, the march of sectional progress is hastened, and the standard of civilization is greatly elevated. Such, however, is the character of these enterprises, and so large is the amount of money required to carry them forward, that none but the rich are able to take part in them. The poor, and those in moderate circumstances, are, therefore, not expected to become stockholders in the mammoth corporations of the land, and if the wealthy were to be so dwarfed in their public spirit, and so hide bound in the use of their substance, as not to originate and support them, it would be impossible to undertake and carry them forward to completion. But in so far as the children of this world favored with wealth, are actuated by that degree of public spirit and commercial enterprise, necessary to invent these instrumentalities and keep them in operation, in so far do they exhibit that characteristic of wisdom, which adapts special means to special ends. And this has been the case among them in all civilized lands, and especially in our own.

But how do the children of light act, under similar circumstances, in advancing the Kingdom of God? In the development of the Church, as the bearer and applicer of the redemption forces, peculiar wants constantly arise, calling for the invention of plans, and the contribution of the funds, necessary to supply them. And some of these wants are so great, and the agencies for meeting them so costly, that unless the rich, and those in more than ordinary circumstances, contribute according to their abundance towards supplying the one and sustaining the other, neither can be done. If, under the stimulus of necessity, such enterprises are nevertheless undertaken, and the poor and those in moderate circumstances, relied upon to carry them forward, without the co-operation of the wealthy as such, it will soon become manifest that their ability is inadequate to the task, and they must consequently languish, if not die.

Let us illustrate this point, by reference to the establishment and endowment of Colleges and Theological Seminaries. This is a work, which will cost at a moderate estimate \$100,000 each. And as every important section of the land and the Church, requires the presence of both as twin sisters \$200,000 will be needed in each to found them. Dividing

our Church territory into five large districts, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland and New York, Ohio, Michigan and Indiana, Illinois and Missouri, Iowa and Kansas, Wisconsin and Minnesota, and we shall need a million of dollars to supply their literary and theological necessities. Now, who does not see, that the peculiar character of the agency necessary to supply these wants, requires the appropriation of such sums of money as the poor in their poverty cannot raise, and that if the rich do not understand the call of God, thus addressed to them, voluntarily to come forward and contribute them, they must all be imperfect in their birth, slow in their growth, sickly in their life, and circumscribed in their influence. Not to be extreme in our position, we will admit, more for argument sake, than because we could not triumphantly sustain the view, which would excuse the poor from taking any part in such a work at all, that they may be called upon in their penury, to cast their mites into the College and Seminary treasuries of the Church; but we yield this to them, more as a special privilege to enable them to feel, that they too had a hand in putting these mighty engines in motion, than as an imposed duty, called for by their pecuniary circumstances. Wisdom, analogy, observation, experience, example, history and Scripture, all sustain us, in maintaining that such expenditures should and must be, mainly, if not entirely, borne by the rich, and those in more than ordinary circumstances. If this be questioned by them, then we put the following interrogatories, and expect a candid and honest reply. A bank with a capital of a hundred thousand dollars, is nothing extraordinary in financial circles. Would they consider it judicious, and be willing to get the stock taken, in sums of, from a cent to a dime—a dime to a dollar—or a dollar to five? Why not? Because they know that the people who could not invest larger sums than these, are not the ones, upon whom they would be willing to call to aid them in establishing banks. A rail road twenty-five miles in length, is no first-class improvement; and yet it would cost more than the five Colleges and Seminaries, for the founding and endowment of which we claim a million of dollars. Would they undertake to raise the funds for building it, in such amounts as they expect us to found and endow institutions with? Why not? Because they would feel that such means were inadequate to accomplish such ends, and that the time, and labor required to secure and collect such subscriptions of stock, would, in their estimation, be worth more than

all the proceeds combined. In short, they would not apply minimum means to maximum ends—they would not attempt with a one horse power to draw a hundred car freight train across the Alleghenies. And yet, this is the work that the wealthy men of the Church, expect us to do, without their contributions, in such sums as shall characterize them as those of the rich, but in such sums, as no one can distinguish from those of the poor. In other words, they desire to be considered, and prove that they are, rich in every sphere and relation of life, except in their Church sphere, and their spiritual relations to their associated members and their fellow men. We have given considerable attention to the subject of establishing institutions of learning: we have some experience in raising funds for their endowment; and we have cast our eye over the amounts, contributed for this purpose by our Church members in this country, and we are constrained to say, that no living rich man has yet appeared as such, in the amount of his contributions, to any of our institutions of learning. We have rich men in every section—multitudes of them. They appear as such, on the tax and stock books, as farmers, mechanics, lawyers, doctors, merchants, bankers, &c., but no one has as yet appeared, so far as our knowledge extends on the Church books, as a benevolent contributor to our Colleges and Seminaries, in such sums as rich men alone ought and can give to such objects. The Lutheran Church in the United States has not trained one rich man who has endowed a professorship in any one of our Colleges or Seminaries. The East has not educated one in the School of her benevolence, who has given \$10,000 or even \$5,000 to either institution at Gettysburg—not even a score who have given \$1,000 apiece. The West carried forward a thousand dollar plan, of our own conception and practical inauguration, for the endowment of a professorship in Wittenberg College to a successful issue, and at the College endowment convention, lately held at Dayton Ohio, three men subscribed \$5,000 apiece, one \$4,000, another \$3,000, another \$2,500, another \$2,000, and several others \$1,000—eleven men contributing \$30,000, six of whom belonged to the congregation of the Church in which it was held, and who gave \$21,000 of this amount. These \$5,000 subscriptions are the highest ever made by individuals, and these \$21,000 constitute the largest amount ever contributed by any congregation, belonging to the Lutheran Church in the United States. We trust that the commendable example



thus set, may be initiated by the rich men of the West, and their mantle fall on the rich men of the East, so that a new era may dawn upon the Church, in which her institutions shall be endowed, her languishing enterprises resuscitated, her vast resources developed, and her glorious mission in America fully accomplished.

And as multitudes of the wealthy men in other denominations, have contributed to their great benevolent enterprises, by tens and hundreds of thousands; Union College receiving \$600,000 from Dr. Nott, and Yale College half a million during the last few years, reasons must exist why such things have not been done by the rich men of our denomination. We do not believe that these are found in the deficiencies of our Church, or the incapacity of our members to rise to the accomplishment of great things. We attribute their lack of benevolent enterprise, rather to the want of proper parental training, deficient mental culture, and inadequate pastoral handling. A standard of benevolence worthy of their contemplation has not been held up before them, examples for their imitation among their fellows have not occurred, and the obligation to give according to *their* ability, has not been adequately impressed upon them. They have been too often treated as though they were incapable of better things, and their consciences eased, and their benevolent disposition spoiled, by fulsome praise, when they gave such sums, as for them to give were a mere pittance. Let all this be changed? Give them a different training at home, and a different handling in the Church! Devise liberal things, and call upon them alone to accomplish them! Exhibit in glowing colors the benevolent examples of Scripture, and proclaim, now in melting and then in thunder tones, the law of benevolence ordained by God! Warn them against the insidious wiles of Mammon, and stimulate them with the blessed results and the glorious rewards of benevolence! And we vouch for it, both from knowledge and experience, that the rich men of the Lutheran Church, will prove themselves capable of emulating the example set them, by so many of the rich men in other denominations.

Nor have our rich men remembered our institutions of learning, according to the abundance with which God has favored them, in the disposition of their substance at death. Hartwick and Fry are exceptions to this assertion, the former devoting his estate to the founding of the Seminary which bears his name, and the latter to the founding of an Orphan



Asylum at Middletown, Pa. Here and there one has made a small bequest either to the College or the Seminary, but the great mass in making their wills, seem to have entirely overlooked the claims of our institutions.

We commend those, whose necessities require the use of their substance during life, if they devote a large portion of it to God at death, but how much better it would be for suffering humanity, and how much more pleasing to God, if they could all be induced to sow bountifully while they live, that they might see the fruits and enjoy the blessedness of their benevolence before they die.

And how does this deficiency of wisdom affect our Church institutions and benevolent enterprises? It puts a heavy break upon the movements of all our Colleges and Seminaries, and dwarfs all our other religious efforts. It compels us to attempt to promote mammoth ends with pigmy means. It diverts the mites of the poor from the treasuries of Beneficiary Education, Home and Foreign Missions and Church Extension, and leaves them entirely inadequate to meet the calls made upon them. It discourages obedience to the command, "to devise liberal things for the Lord," because those who do so, are not sustained in accomplishing them, by the donations of the thousands in the hands of the rich. In a word, it compels us to operate with horse-power on a common road, instead of steam on a rail road, necessitates us to devote our Church energies to pulling stalled enterprises out of deep sloughs, instead of regulating mighty engines on the track of progress; and it characterizes our Synodical meetings with disappointment in reviewing the past, and with discouragement in anticipating the future. And as in this respect the conduct of the children of this world, stands in strong contrast with that of the children of light, it follows still, that the wisdom of the former, is superior to that of the latter.

In conclusion we remark, that we have endeavored to do full justice to the wisdom manifested by the children of this world, in the promotion of their bodily and temporal ends. But we should do them great injury, if we left them under the impression, that theirs was true wisdom. It is nothing more than animal instinct, under the higher guidance of natural reason. It has its representative in the cunning of the serpent, and the prudence of the unjust steward. It could in both cases forecast future necessities, make provision for them, and get the most out of them. In its sphere, and

for sensuous ends, it has some of the characteristics of true wisdom, and as such deserves to be presented to those moving in a higher sphere, and devoted to the attainment of superior ends, for their imitation. But when the children of this world are contemplated, as rational and immortal beings, and as capable, through God's abounding grace, of attaining moral recovery here, and spiritual blessedness hereafter, and nevertheless neglect to rise to this sphere, and to devote themselves to these ends, then does their grovelling in the sphere of animal life, and their entire devotion to the enjoyment of mere sensuous happiness, become supreme folly. And as spirit is more than matter, soul higher than body, character superior to happiness, eternity more enduring than time, and heaven more precious than earth, so too are the ends to which the children of light have devoted their lives, superior to those to which the children of the world have devoted theirs, and the wisdom manifested by the former, in whatever degree, is nevertheless true wisdom, and as such superior to that of the latter.

In extenuation of the low degree of true wisdom, manifested by the children of light, it must be remembered, that they have the same individual, domestic and political wants, which the children of this world have; that they have not only the right but that it is also their duty to supply them; that they have done their full share of that, as their associates and fellow citizens; and that what they have done to meet their own spiritual wants and those of mankind, they have done over and above, what they have done, in common with their fellow men, for the promotion of their united earthly interests. And further, that while the children of this world, mostly confine their efforts to making provision for their local necessities, as families, communities, and nations, the children of light are called upon to make spiritual provision, for the moral necessities of all the families, communities, and nations of the earth. And while the children of this world as such, limit their means in general, to the attainment of the ends of civilization among themselves, the children of light are necessitated, in attaining the higher ends of the evangelization of the nations, to furnish them at the same time, with the means of attaining the lower ends of their civilization. Hence they must send not only the Bible, the Missionary and the Professor; but with them the agriculturalist, the mechanic, the printer and the physician, as it has been practically illus-

trated in the evangelization of Liberia and the Sandwich Islands. But notwithstanding these explanatory and palliating circumstances, it still remains true, that the children of light have manifested the characteristics of wisdom, referred to in this article in a comparatively low degree. Were they to open their eyes fully to the immensity of the extent, and the inexpressible greatness of the spiritual and internal interests of a lost world, and contrast with them, the comparative littleness of their own bodily wants and earthly happiness, and devote themselves to the advancement of the former, in a manner commensurate with their true value, and demanded alike by their professions, and ability, their obligations and interests, then would their wisdom rise in its degree, until it would not only be superior to that of the children of this world in its means and ends, but far transcend it, in all its characteristics.

It must be admitted, however, that the children of light have not only not manifested these characteristics of wisdom, in anything like an equal degree with the children of this world, but that by pursuing such a course, they become and remain a contradiction to themselves. They, as both natural and spiritual beings, can move in two spheres of life at the same time, and devote themselves to the advancement of their respective interests. As natural they belong still to the natural, as spiritual they belong to the spiritual world, as natural they may be classified with, and called by the name of, the children of this world, as spiritual they belong to, and are called the children of light—as natural, they manifest the same characteristics of wisdom in prosecuting their various vocations for the attainment of their earthly ends, as their associates do, who have no communion with them in the sphere of the spiritual world—as spiritual they exhibit the characteristics of that wisdom in an inferior degree. The wisdom manifested by them then as children of this world, is superior to that manifested by them as children of light. In other words, their development involves a contradiction, inasmuch as it violates the fitness of things. When, however, their spiritual progress shall be such, that the time, substance and labor spent in the attainment of the ends of each sphere, shall correspond with the respective values of their ends, as determined in the light of both time and eternity, then will this contradiction in their natural and spiritual history cease, and their professions and their lives will become consistent with each other.

And shall "a consummation so devoutly to be wished," never be attained? Must the truth declared by Christ be regarded not only as stating an historic fact, verified at the time of its utterance, but likewise as a prophecy to be multiplied in its fulfilment in every denomination in every land, down to the end of time? Forbid it heaven! It was not so meant by the blessed Saviour, or He never could have commanded the children of light, to preach the Gospel to every creature, and promised to be with them, in doing so, even unto the end of the world. The Redeemer stated it in sorrow, as a humiliating fact. He intended that they should so consider it, as to be rebuked by it, and so improve it, that the time might soon come, when the wisdom of the children of light might excel, beyond comparison in all its characteristics, that of the children of this world. But as that time has not yet arrived, the painful fact still stares us in the face, and the ministry of this age is called upon to loose its paralyzed tongue, in order that it may administer its scathing reproof, and point its portentous finger, in terrible warning to a judgment to come.

And just in proportion as the ministry has met its obligations in this respect, has the wisdom of the children of light increased in all its characteristics. The ministry of apostolic times stands forth in bold relief, by the side of that of subsequent ages, and the wisdom manifested by the primitive Christians whom they trained, puts to the blush that exhibited by professors of religion in our day. Examine their history. Test their lives by the characteristics of wisdom just presented, and that of the great mass of them will pass through the ordeal uncondemned. And just in proportion as the ministry of any denomination and age, has imitated the example thus set them by the Apostles and their immediate successors, in that degree has the wisdom of the children of light risen, and the number of the exceptions to the general folly among them increased. Under the faithful inculcation of the obligation to manifest the wisdom enjoined, the Moravians have exhibited one aspect of it in their devotion to Foreign Missions; the Methodists another, in their pioneer work in Home Missions; the Baptists another in the concentration of their efforts; the Episcopalians another in building Churches in the large cities; the Presbyterian another in multiplying Church literature; and the Congregationalists another in founding and endowing Institutions of learning. Now let that aspect of wisdom exhibited more especially by

one denomination, be exhibited by all, and every other aspect be cultivated by each in the same degree, and the reproach of Zion would soon cease and the truth declared by the Saviour, reversed in its subjects; for the children of light would then be wiser in their generation, than the children of this world. And if the ministry of any denomination and age, could expect to see their efforts crowned with success, in inculcating the duty of exhibiting these characteristics of wisdom, in individual cases, congregations, and denominations, what is to prevent the success of the ministry of every age and denomination in the faithful discharge of the same duty? They can wield the same weapon of truth, exhibit the same examples of its practice, plead the same promise of the Spirit, direct attention to the same crying destitution, point to the same glorious rewards, and deliver the same awful threatening. Fidelity in doing so, must therefore, result in the same moral achievement.

And what is the duty of the Lutheran ministry in this country and in the world? What is the call of Providence directed to them at all times but especially at this time? It is to form clear conceptions of the characteristics of wisdom, enjoined upon all the children of light by the Saviour and inculcated in this article. It is to realize that all our deficiencies arise from their violation among us. It is to know that all our hopes for improvement must be based upon their proper inculcation, acknowledgment and practice; and it is to determine, by the help of God, to correct our mistakes, abandon our errors, and do our whole duty, from this very hour. Thus alone can the Lutheran children of light, entrusted to the training of the Lutheran ministers of light, become as individuals, stars of light; as congregations, moons of light; as district synods, worlds of light; as general synods, suns of light, and as a denomination, a system of light, revolving around Christ, the great Centre of light, in the glorious Heaven of light forever and ever.



## ARTICLE II.

INSTRUCTION IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE ACCORDING TO  
THE SYSTEM OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH  
—BY JOHN HENRY KURTZ, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THE  
UNIVERSITY OF DORPAT.—TRANSLATED FROM THE  
SIXTH GERMAN EDITION.

By REV. EDWARD J. KOONS, A. M., Brooklyn, N. Y.

### PART I.—OF THE DIVINE LAW.

#### §11. *The Law.*

The Law (from to *lay down*, equivalent, to *firmly establish*) is the determining of that which man is to do, or to leave undone. The divine law is not only the most complete and holy, but also the foundation and source of all human laws.

James 4: 12.—“There is one law-giver, who is able to save, and to destroy.”

#### §12. *The Law in the Heart.*

God has first of all written his law *in the hearts* of all men. This is the voice of *conscience*, innate in every one, which, against the will, makes itself heard in the soul, as a witness and judge of all transactions.

Romans 2: 14, 15.

Obs. 1.—Of the power of conscience in man, the Holy Scriptures present a number of examples, which we should lay to heart. For example: Adam, (Genesis 3: 7—11,)—Cain, (Gen. 4: 13, 14,)—Joseph's brethren, (Gen. 42: 21,)—David, (Psalm 51,)—Herod, (St. Matt. 14: 2,)—Judas, (St. Matt. 27: 3—5,)—Felix, (Acts of the Apostles 24: 25,) etc.

Obs. 2.—Why is the *reproving voice* of conscience after sin stronger and less easily stilled, than its *warning voice* before sin?

#### §13. *Conscience.*

Therefore it is a holy duty, in no way to stifle the conscience or permit it to become dormant, but much more to keep it constantly awakened and active, and always to render

it more tender. It helps very much to this end, if we observe its slightest motions, and allow its admonitions and warnings to be productive of results, without first consulting with flesh and blood. But much more will the conscience be strengthened and sharpened, if it derives its nourishment from the revealed word of God and seeks in it, its fountain of life.

#### §14. *The Power of Sin.*

Through sin, the voice of conscience is weakened in us, and by example, habit, and exercise in sin it becomes weaker and more unsafe. On this account the law written in the heart does not any longer suffice, and God has once more revealed his holy will and had it recorded in the Holy Scriptures, as an eternal, unalterable testimony.

Obs.—How far can man progress by the aid of conscience alone, ancient and modern heathenism shows.

#### §15. *The Blessing and Curse of the Law.*

The Law has a divine blessing for those who obey\* it, and a divine curse against those, who transgress† it.

#### §16. *The Law, a Mirror, a Barrier, a Bridle.*

The divine law is *a mirror*, which reveals to us truly and without any disguise, the moral condition of the inner man. It is *a barrier* which obstructs the entrance of sin into the heart. It is *a bridle* designed to guide us in the way of life, and to deter us from the way of destruction.

#### §17. *The Ten Commandments.*

The *Decalogue* or the Ten Commandments,‡ which spoke to his chosen people of the old covenant from Sinai, and which he graved with his own hand upon the two tables of stone, contain briefly the substance of the whole law.§ They do not however relate only to the people of the old covenant, but to all people and periods.|| •

#### §18. *Each Commandment, in itself an entire Department.*

Each commandment, in itself comprises an *entire department of the moral life*, in a short expression, easily impressed, inculcated, and on account of its brevity immediately impressed upon the memory. It cannot therefore cover the

\*Lev. 18: 5.

†Deut. 27: 26; Gal. 3: 10.

‡Exodus 20: 1-17; compare Deut. 5: 6-21.

§Neh. 9: 13.

||Ecclesiastes 12: 13; Luke 10: 25, 28.

whole department to which it belongs, but can only touch the chief points in it. In the explanation of each commandment, however, we must naturally elucidate all its roots and branches in the light of the divine will.

### §19. *Classification of the Commandments.*

All the separate spheres of life, which are embraced in the ten commandments, can again be arranged under two chief heads—*Duties toward God* and *Duties toward our Neighbor*. Both stand in the most intimate relationship towards each other. The love of God is the basis of love for our neighbor. This division corresponds to the arrangement of the ten commandments into the two tables of the law.

Matt. 22: 37–40.

Obs.—We have especially also duties towards ourselves, and if the decalogue seems to pass over these entirely, it is only in appearance. Every commandment which enforces duty towards God or towards our neighbor, has also a side which looks towards our own welfare and salvation. We cannot therefore better care for ourselves, than when we love God above all things and our neighbor *as ourselves*.

### §20. *The Decalogue negative in form.*

The separate demands of the Decalogue appear nearly all in a negative form, (that which is forbidden,) because they already find the desire and inclination to sin in man. A proper fulfilling of the law however requires not only refraining from evil, but also the doing of good.\* On this account Luthér has rightly presented in his explanation, the other (positive) side, viz., that which is commanded.

### §21. *Intention and Act.*

The ten commandments indeed speak only of *the act* as the extreme point of a moral life. But *the act* is good or bad, according as the intention from which it proceeds is good or bad. Therefore the sinful intention, without the sinful act, is just as much a transgression of the command as with it. We must also with every command go back into the inner depths of the heart, which indeed is concealed from man, but is open before God.

1 Samuel 16: 7. Ps. 7: 10; 139: 23. Matt. 12: 33, 35.

### §22. *The Introductory Words.*

The introductory words of the Decalogue, "*I am the Lord*,"

\*James 4: 17.

*thy God,*" belong not only to the first commandment, but extend equally to the others. They express the right of the Lawgiver to demand obedience, and the duty of the people to obey.

### §23. *The Relative Clause.*

The additional clause, "*which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage,*" relates to us as well as to the Israelites. For the Lord has delivered us from a house of bondage, (that of sin,) and will conduct us into the heavenly Canaan. This clause points to the truth, that not only *duty*, but also *gratitude* should prompt us to obey these commandments.

1 John 4: 19.

## FIRST TABLE.

### *Our duties towards God.*

#### *First Commandment.*

THOU SHALT HAVE NO OTHER GODS BEFORE ME.

Exod. 20: 2—4. I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.

#### *What is this?*

WE SHOULD FEAR, LOVE AND TRUST IN GOD ABOVE ALL THINGS.

### §24. *Gross Idolatry.*

This first commandment forbids all *idolatry*. This occurs when the heart is turned from the living God and loves, honors or fears anything else as much as, or even more than the one true God. Idolatry is called gross, when man, in gross ignorance and spiritual blindness, worships a creature instead of the Creator, and really thinks that it is God.

Isaiah 42: 8; Romans 1: 23; Psalm 135: 15—17.

Obs. 1.—Gross idolatry is never original, but always a consequence of the fall and degeneracy. It has grown out of the corruption of the heart, and is completed in the blinding of the understanding. "*Corrupt according to the deceitful lusts,*" (Eph. 4: 22.)—this is the history of the development of idolatry. Compare Romans 1: 19, &c. But wherever

Christianity forces its way, it dispels by its light, this darkness. Yet, there are still upwards of five hundred million human souls ensnared in the grossest idolatry with all its abominations. What a call for missionary zeal and missionary labor.

Obs. 2.—We, who have grown up under the blessings of Christianity, are indeed protected from the snares of such idolatry, and also from other ungodly tendencies of life. Nevertheless there is a species of gross idolatry, which is also in vogue among Christians, viz: *superstition*. This, instead of acknowledging itself dependent solely upon the living God, imagines itself dependent upon occasional visions, good and bad omens, and the like. This kind of idolatry exists not only among the ignorant and spiritually neglected, but also frequently enough among the highly educated and refined. Not only excessive credulity but also incredulity conducts to superstition, because the heart of man must have something to which it can confidently give itself. It must feel itself dependent upon something higher. Is it not the living God, so is it a blind destiny (fate) or the like. Only too frequently do we find men, who deny God and immortality, but who on the contrary, give themselves up trustingly to *fortune-telling, omens, dreams, pre-sentiments* and the like; perhaps secretly, lest they should become a laughing-stock.

### §25. *Refined Idolatry.*

*Refined idolatry* exists where man fears, loves and trusts anything in the world more than, or even as much as, God, and yet knows, that is not God. Refined idolatry is a pure blinding of the heart, and is on that account more wicked and dangerous than gross idolatry. It manifests itself in *self-deification*, in *deifying our fellow men*, or finally in *deifying the world and its lusts*.

### §26. *Self-Idolatry.*

If man loves himself more than God, or trusts in his own power, wisdom and virtue more than in the blessing, assistance and grace of God, it is *self-idolatry*.

Jeremiah 9 : 23, 24.



§27. *Man-Idolatry.*

Man *idolizes his fellow-men*, when he fears,\* loves,† or trusts,‡ father or mother, wife or child, friends and benefactors, nobles and mighty men, more than God.

§28. *World-Idolatry.*

Finally, that man *idolizes the world and its lusts*, who finds more pleasure in its *honors, fame, pride, vanity, enjoyments and lusts, money and estates*, than in God and his service, and strives more zealously after them, than the pleasure of God and the salvation of his soul.

1 John 2: 15–17; Philippians 3: 19.

§29. *God and Creature Worship.*

The service of God and of the creature cannot exist together. We must indeed love and honor the creature, and the more, when we see the image of God mirrored in him, but not on account of himself, but for God's sake, who has placed him over or under us, or made him our equal.

1 Kings 18: 21; Matt. 6: 24; 2 Cor. 6: 15.

§30. *Right Obedience.*

A true obedience to the first commandment, consists in this, that we *fear, love, and trust in God above all things*.

1. *Fear God above all things.*

## §31.

The *fear of God*, which is the beginning of wisdom, (Psalm 111: 10,) consists in this,—that we place our whole life, all our thoughts, words and deeds, in the light of God's countenance; (Psalm 99: 8,) and by means of a lively consciousness of the holiness and righteousness, the omnipresence and omniscience of the all-powerful God, be kept from every sin and impelled to every good work.¶

## §32.

The *true fear of God* is not the servile fear of the unconverted sinner, who flees from the presence of God, without feeling any sorrow for sin, and trembles from fear of the judgment. It is much more the childlike fear of the pious.

\*Acts 5: 29; Matt. 10: 28. †Matt. 10: 37. ‡Jer. 17: 15.

¶Genesis 17: 1. ¶Matt. 10: 28; Jeremiah 10: 6, 7; Rev. 15: 4.

who walk before God and fear and avoid nothing so much as grieving and provoking their Heavenly Father through new sins.\* A servile fear cannot exist with love. A childlike fear is the ground work of love.†

## 2. Love God above all things.

### §33.

The nature of love is self-renunciation, consecration, fellowship, salvation, (1 Cor. 13.) Our love towards God, therefore, if it be of the right kind, manifests itself in ardent aspirations after union with Him;‡ in the blessedness of communion with Him;§ in the need to praise Him, by word and deed, before the whole world;¶ in the effort to live according to His pleasure;\*\*\* and in a joyful willingness to suffer for his name and truth's sake.††

### §34.

The power and strength of our love for God, is grounded in God's love for us, from which it also derives its constant nourishment and invigoration.

Romans 8 : 35, 37-39; 1 John 4 : 10.

### §35.

We should love God above all things, because he alone is good, and the source of all good;‡ because he first loved us; § and because the love of God makes us happy in this life and in the life to come.¶¶

## 3. Trust in God above all things.

### §36.

Trust in God, consists,—in a joyous and confiding surrender of ourselves to the guidance of God;\*\*\* in every need of body and soul, in life and in death to have recourse to the Lord;††† patiently to wait if help tarries:‡‡‡ and firmly to believe that God will do everything for the best.|||||

\*Genesis 39:9. †1 John 4:18.

‡Psalms 73:25, 26; 42:2, 3; Isaiah 26; 8, 9. ||Psalm 63:6.

¶Psalm 146:2; 103:1-5. \*\*1 John 5:3. ††Acts 5:41.

‡‡Mark 10:18; James 1:17. |||1 John 4:19.

¶¶Rom. 8:28; 1 Tim. 4:8. §Ps. 37:5; Jer. 17:7; Ps. 13:5; 91:1, 2. †††Ps. 121:1-4; 90:1; Jer. 16:19. ‡‡‡Ps. 42:12; Is. 39:15; 49:31; Heb. 4:15. |||||Rom. 8:1, 2; Ps. 77:11; Is. 28:29.

## §37.

*Anxious care* is plainly incompatible with trust in God. For *care* rests upon the foolish and sinful idea that man must help himself; and upon the heathenish and comfortless view, that there is no living God in the world. *Care* moreover is not our business, but God's. Our business is:—Pray and Work—and these are the opposite of *care*.

Matt. 6: 25–34; 1 Peter 5: 7; Philippians 4: 6; 1 Thess. 4: 11; Ps. 127: 1, 2.

§38. *Image Worship.*

The clause:—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness \* \* \* \* \* thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them \* \* \*" is according to the Lutheran Division of the Decalogue, attached to the first commandment. Nevertheless it can also properly be regarded, with the Reformed as a special or second commandment; which makes the union of the ninth and tenth into one commandment necessary. At any rate idolatry and image worship are more easily kept separate, than what is forbidden in the ninth and tenth commandments. Idolatry then would be the worship of false Gods. Image worship would consist in false worship of the true God, as for instance, that of Aaron (Exodus 32: 5) and of Jeroboam (1 Kings 12: 26–30.)

§39. *Gross Image Worship.*

There is a gross image worship, like the calf-worship of the Israelites. This forgets that God is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in Spirit and in truth; and gives that worship, which is due alone to the invisible God, to the visible image and likeness.

Obs. In the Old Testament, the worship of images of God was not only strictly forbidden, but also the making and possessing them. In the New Testament this has been changed. Since God was manifested in human form and nature in Christ, and in this form lived among us, suffered, died, arose again and ascended into Heaven, we can thus represent him, and have in our Churches and houses, for the purpose of remembering him, and for inciting to and promoting meditation, pictures, crucifixes and the like. The worship of them is indeed as much forbidden under the New Testament as under the Old.

§40. *Refined Image Worship.*

This divine commandment has an earnest warning for us also. For not only with our hands can we make idolatrous images of God in wood, stone, metals and colors, but also with our reason, in the thoughts of the heart and in our knowledge. There is also a refined image worship, which is yet more dangerous than the gross. We fall into this if we think and believe otherwise concerning God's nature and attributes, than he has himself represented and recorded in his revealed world. (2 Timothy 4: 3, 4.)

§41. *Comprehensiveness of first Commandment.*

The first commandment embraces all commandments, because the fear and love of God must be the source from which all our conduct proceeds.\* What does not come from this source is sin, and displeasing to God, however it may sparkle and shine.† Therefore Luther very correctly educes obedience to all the other commandments from this first one, in that, he begins the explanation of each separate commandment with the words "We should so fear and love God, as &c."

*The Second Commandment.*

THOU SHALT NOT TAKE THE NAME OF THE LORD, THY GOD, IN VAIN; FOR THE LORD WILL NOT HOLD HIM GUILTLESS THAT TAKETH HIS NAME IN VAIN.

*What is this?*

*We should so fear and love God as not to curse, swear, conjure, lie or deceive by his name; but call upon him in every time of need, and worship him with prayer, praise, and thanksgiving.*

§42. *Oral Service.*

The *first* commandment treats of that service of God which the heart renders. The *second* of that which the lips perform. The first refers to the divine nature; the second to the name of God. The name of an object is the index of its nature. The name God especially is a *compressed* designation of everything which God has been pleased to reveal concerning his nature and attributes. The separate names mark the characteristics of his revealed nature according to their special relations.

\*Rom. 13: 10; 1 Tim. 1: 5; Matt. 22: 37-40. †1 Cor. 13: 1-3.

Obs.—The name *God*, in a broader sense, has a scope of unfathomably deep and comprehensive significance. This sense it always has, when we speak of the name of God in a general way; for instance when we say:—to confess the name of God, to believe in the name of God, to do anything in the name of God, etc.

#### §43. *Vain use of God's name.*

We take the name of God in vain, if we use it thoughtlessly, without any purpose, or blasphemously for a base one, as by cursing, swearing, conjuring, lying and deceiving.

#### §44. *Thoughtless use.*

We sin in the thoughtless use of the name of God when we read or hear of the revealed nature and word of God, without being deeply penetrated with the holiness of the subject—or, when we, without reverence and awe, from mere habit or levity, pronounce any one of the special names of God.

Matthew 12: 36.

#### §45. *Cursing.*

Cursing is calling down upon oneself or others, the judgment and chastisements of God. When this proceeds from human passion, it is under any circumstances sin and crime.

James 3: 9, 10; Romans 12: 14; Luke 9: 51–55.

Obs.—The curse, like vengeance (Rom. 12: 19; Heb. 10: 30) belongs only to the righteous and holy judgment of God. Such a curse can proclaim through man, and naturally then he is not chargeable with sin, who proclaims the curse in the name and by the command of God. (Examples:—Noah, Jacob, the prophets.) In like manner, it is not improper, but much more a holy Christian duty, to keep before the thoughtless sinner the curse and judgment of God as contained in his word, in order that he may be converted and escape the curse hanging over him.

Leviticus 19; 17.

#### §46. *Swearing.*

Swearing consists in calling upon the All-wise and holy God to be a witness of the truth, and an avenger of falsehood. False swearing or perjury, is a most horrible crime, because it is an open insult to the Omniscience, Omnipotence and Holiness of God.\* Swearing itself is altogether evil in

\*Lev. 19: 12; Ez. 17: 19; Gal. 6: 7.



its origin,\* for man should so live, in the truth and in the sight of God, that his simple *yes* or *no* should be as sacred to him and command as much confidence from others, as the most solemn and formal oath; and he should recoil from a false *yes* or *no*, as much as from formal perjury. Inasmuch however as this is not the case, but on the contrary both gross and subtle falsehood so universally prevails among men, (§119) therefore the oath cannot be dispensed with, in important matters.†

Obs.—The words of Christ in Matthew 5: 34–37, have been frequently understood as though an oath, in itself and under all circumstances, were sin. That this is an error is manifest from Matt. 26: 63, where Christ himself sanctions a formal oath. The evil is not in the oath itself, but in that which makes an oath necessary, namely the sad but unquestionable fact, that a want of truthfulness, according to circumstances, is to be feared from every one. (Ps. 116: 11; Rom. 3: 4.) The requirement of Christ, like all divine commandments, extends to the secret workings of the heart. (§21.) If the necessity of the oath exists there, that is if a man would not speak the truth without an oath, then is the oath, even the true oath, sin in the highest degree. If the necessity however, does not rest with him, who is to take it, but with him who demands it, as a confirmation of truth and honesty, the true basis of that forbidden disappears, and the Christian can without sin, take the oath demanded. The demand for the oath is also justifiable, because it is indispensable to the most positive establishment of the truth. This pertains especially to those in authority, who need the most accurate and certain knowledge of the truth, by which they are to judge, defend and punish, so that they may discharge faithfully the office entrusted to them by God. As a guide to the Christian, concerning the oath, the example of Christ (1 Peter 2: 21,) is the safest rule. For the enforcement of his utterances to his disciples and the people he used only the simple *yes* and *amen*. He did not refuse, however, to take the oath administered to him by the authorities (the high-priest Matt. 26: 63.) In like manner the Christian may take an oath, when the authorities require it, or when the subject in hand is of such importance, that the reproach of a frivolous or unnecessary use of the most Holy Name cannot find place. Beyond this he should satisfy himself with a simple,

\*Matt. 5: 34–37; Jas. 5: 12. †Deut. 6: 13; 10: 20; Hebrews 6: 16

but under all circumstances strictly true and credible *Yes* and *No*.

#### §47. *Conjuring.*

Conjuring in the name of God consists, in using his Name, Word and Sacrament, without faith and according to our own selfish desires, for the purpose of learning what God has concealed, or attaining what God has desired us. (Examples 1 Sam. 28: 7, &c.; Acts 16: 16: 19: 13, 19; Deut. 18: 10—12.)

Obs.—The sinfulness of conjuring, does not depend upon the possibility of attaining the result aimed at by it, but simply upon the fact, that under any circumstances to do it ourselves or have others do it for us is a sinful and blasphemous use of God's name.

#### §48. *Lying and Deception.*

Lying and deception in God's name, does not only occur in false swearing, but also by hypocrisy and lip-service, as for instance, when the name of God is upon our lips, but not in the heart,\* again, when we use the word of God to inculcate false doctrine;† or, when we strengthen ourselves or others in levity and false-security by the mercy and long-suffering of God.‡

#### §49. *Commination.*

Inasmuch as man overlooks and regards as trifles these sins because they occur in word only, God has added to the commandment *the threat*, that he will certainly not permit the blasphemers of his name to go unpunished.

Ezek. 17: 18—20; Gal. 6: 7; Heb. 10: 31.

#### §50. *Right use of God's name.*

As not only he makes a vain use of *earthly gifts* who uses them for bad ends, but also he who does not use them at all, so is it with the *heavenly* gifts of God's name and word. Obedience to the second commandment includes also the right use of the name of God, and this consists in calling upon Him in every time of need, and in prayer, praise and thanksgiving.

\*Ps. 50: 16, 17; Matt. 7: 21—23; 15: 7, 8.

†Deut. 4: 2; Acts 15: 1, 24; Gal. 1: 6—8; Rev. 22: 18, 19.

‡Heb. 10: 26; Jude 4.

§51. *Call in need.*

To call upon God's name in every time of need, is, to seek help in God above all things, both every common and unusual necessity, be it ever so great or small. This has the promise of a gracious answer.

Ps. 50: 15; 145: 18.

§52. *Prayer.*

Prayer in the name of God, is to bring before Him, in heartfelt discourse characterised by faith and a childlike humility, and pleading his commandments and promises, all our cares, both common and unusual.

Eph. 6: 18; 1 Tim. 2: 1.

§53. *Praise.*

To praise the name of God, is to have the heart so full of his grace and glory, that one cannot do otherwise,\* than joyfully to confess his name before all the world,† and praise Him by word‡ and deed.||

§54. *Thanksgiving.*

Thanksgiving in the name of God, is joyfully and humbly to acknowledge and confess that whatever good thing we have, are, or do, is only by the grace and unmerited beneficence of God. If this confession be an honest one, our thankfulness will be confirmed by our actions, in appropriating the gifts of God not according to our own will, but according to the pleasure of God.

Eph. 5: 20.

\*Matt. 12: 34; Acts 4: 20. †Matt. 10: 32, 33; Rom. 1: 16.

‡Col. 3: 16. ||Job 1: 21; Matt. 5: 16; John 21: 19.

, Vol. XV. No. 60. 64

## ARTICLE III.

## THE STUDY OF THE ANCIENT CLASSICS.

By CHARLES SHORT, A. M., President of Kenyon College.

Amid the great improvements and changes of modern times, it is a fact worthy of notice that there has been but little change in the subject of education, of education we mean in its higher forms. Indeed from the revival of learning and the introduction of the general study of Greek in Europe by the refugees from Constantinople in the fifteenth century, the study of Greek and Latin and the Mathematics had been pursued steadily and with great earnestness down to the middle of the last century, since which time the classics have been studied with a degree of accuracy and enthusiasm before unknown. In the waking up of the nations at the period of the Reformation, classical study received a mighty impulse, and two centuries later with the labors of Ernesti and Heyne in Germany they received a still further impulse, and this was felt in Holland, France, England and America. Wherever there has been any great activity of mind, and wherever religion has been cultivated with a true sense of its importance, there the classics have flourished; and to-day the study of the classics is at its lowest ebb in France, the nation the least Protestant of those just mentioned; and classical studies are most earnestly pursued in Germany, the land which gave birth to the Reformation and which from that time to this has done most for Biblical and Theological science. Those who know history, whether political, literary or religious, know that the most distinguished men of modern times, have with but very few exceptions indeed the advantage of classical training. To such the fruits of these studies are well known and need no defence. But it is often asked by those who do not know the history of this matter; What is the use of continuing the study of Greek and Latin in modern times? Why not give the attention to other subjects, such as the Mathematics, the material sciences, or study modern languages and literature instead?

It is our present purpose to answer these reasonable questions.

A knowledge of numbers and magnitudes is so obviously necessary in every department of human activity, that there

is no occasion to defend the study of the mathematics in a course of education. An acquaintance with the elements of this study is necessary for every one and every one sees the necessity. The dependence of our material interests on the higher mathematics, as in navigation, surveying, warfare, and the calculation of forces in the mechanical arts in general, has at once been the necessity and encouragement of their pursuit, at least by a number sufficient to sustain those interests. Hence the universality of the study of the elementary mathematics, the steady pursuit of the higher mathematics by a certain number in all Institutions of learning, and hence their admitted utility. They have occupied some place in education from the earliest times and their relation to the common and material wants of man will always secure a proper degree of attention to them. And the same may be said of the material sciences. Nor to one who reflects upon the subject, will the study of language be deemed of less importance; indeed in some aspects of the matter, the study of language is of still greater importance than the study of the mathematics. The foundation and support of all culture whatsoever is language. Language is the very instrument of thought; the means of conveying all thought on all subjects, material or spiritual, scientific or literary, from one mind to another, whether orally or by the written or printed page. Without language the mind is unfurnished with means to carry on its own reflections or to communicate them to others; and the greater and more accurate the power of language is, the more able is the mind to carry on and to communicate its own activity. Viewed in this light, it appears that the study of language should precede all others and accompany all others, and that it is eminently the study which must always be pursued in order to sustain the subordinate forms of activity. Language is at once the production and the producer of thought.

A nation of rude and simple ideas will have a meagre dialect, and a nation with refined and profound habits of thought will possess a rich and highly developed language; and from the reflex action of language itself, the rude nation is kept rude by its want of mental furniture, and the cultivated nation grows more refined and contemplative by the very process of handling its own multiplied and delicate instruments. Thus the index of the mind of a nation is its language. And what is true of nations is true, though less obviously, of individuals. It being a matter of prime necessity that all men



should attend to their physical wants, and even among highly cultivated nations the lower classes doing only this, it will follow that the vocabulary and power of expression among common minds will be confined chiefly to such wants, and the low and rude state in which such minds are and must remain, is obvious. The conduct of the study of language must be intrusted to those who are themselves masters of it, whether a knowledge of it, adequate for the management of ordinary matters only, be required, or the highest and fullest knowledge of it be sought by those who are to take the lead among cultivated minds.

It is then a proper question, what course shall be pursued to give us the best knowledge of language. It is well known that such is the power of association that it is very difficult to study what speech is, in and by itself, if we take our own vernacular tongue. The meaning of our own language is obvious; the sight and sound of the forms are familiar; and we therefore imagine that we have a full knowledge of it. But when we take a foreign language, the study requisite to attain the meaning is favorable to, or rather demands the study of it, in every way, in its sounds, in its forms, in its combinations and its arrangement of words. And there is an additional advantage, if we take a language no longer spoken or liable to change. For what we need is a knowledge of the general laws of human expressions and this can scarcely be gained from the study of a living language, ever fluctuating in its forms and ideas, because it is a living language. The language of Rome and Greece have these prerequisites: they are at once foreign and fixed. The study of them has been adopted for the high purpose which we have described. Have they further claims upon our attention?

It is well known that the natural precedes and ushers in the spiritual; the outward and visible lead to the inward and the invisible. We are first interested in what we see and hear with the outward eye and ear. In the language of heaven, which is at the same time the language of the soundest philosophy, *there is first a natural body and then there is a spiritual body.* If we would teach a child an abstract idea or a moral thought, it must be presented under a sensible image or conveyed in some account of human activity, being neither prefixed nor appended to more interesting matter, but wrought in it. If therefore language is to be studied and studied in its fulness, and studied according to the order of nature, we must study first a language dealing with concrete

images, and afterwards a tongue more abstract and elevated in its nature. Now the language of the Romans grew out of common life, and one of its most marked peculiarities is its deficiency in abstract terms, its abundance of sensible images. Even abstract subjects themselves were thus of necessity perceived by the Romans as sensible, and suggested to them a definite and living conception. A modern language often presents as a vague and general abstraction what the Romans viewed in a particular and definite form. The language of the Roman, like himself, was simple, precise, direct, practical. On the other hand, the language of the Greek was more spiritual, more developed, richer and more complicated in its forms. It had the versatility which arose from an extensive and diverse culture; it had the richness and delicacy of expression which is needed in the intercourse of the most refined nature: it had the strength required to express the thoughts of the most patient and resolved thinkers the world has ever seen. It is plain, then, how well adapted by these peculiarities those languages are to be employed in the cultivation of the young, and how thus the one should succeed and will supplement the other.

But there are other general advantages arising from the choice of these tongues, which relate to civilization and letters. These are the tongues of nations whose civilization and literature stand in closer relation to our own than those of any other nations. The earliest and best civilization of Europe was the Greek; and coeval with this and developed along with it, was a literature the richest and fullest that man has ever produced. The attainments of Greece in the arts, are the most perfect the world has yet known, and her literary monuments have that artistic finish which no subsequent nation has been able to attain. Her thoughts, on almost all subjects of inquiry, are among the most valuable possessed by the human race, and these thoughts are expressed in a form such as to lend them a beauty and a grace almost divine. After a lapse of more than twenty centuries, Greece remains our teacher in architecture and in sculpture: in poetry, philosophy, politics, and history. Rome succeeded Greece in political power and transferred her literature or imitation of it, and in almost every respect was affected and improved by her influence, and may well be said to have owed to the spiritual power of her own subjects; and in subduing the world Rome carried her own language among barbarous nations or employed that of Greece where it was

already in use. Four great nations of Europe, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and France, are still called Roman, from the impress made by this mighty nation upon their language and literature; and such was the Greek and Roman influence upon all the great nations of Europe, that it made the languages of Europe essentially one. The form and spirit of the occidental tongues are classic. This is a most important fact. Thus in the Providence of God, the marvellous attainments of Greece and Rome in civilization, in art, and in literature, have been easy to transmit among these great nations, and at the same time these nations have thus a certain unity among themselves and a facility of converse in traffic, art and letters, which they otherwise would not, and could not possess.

We have said that since the revival of learning the study of the classics has had place in all the higher forms of education. That this has been wise, we trust now appears. But the very fact that they have had such a place, is of great consequence. The great literary works of Europe were written by men who had received this training, whose minds were filled with the ideas derived from classical antiquity and to whom the forms of classic expression were familiar. In every nation the classic spirit has been imbibed and the classic form has been imitated. Coming in close contact with the classic nations, they often borrowed their terms to convey the classic ideas; and as often for the sake of elegance, they introduced into their own tongues, forms about which clustered such rich associations. No greater mistake, therefore, can be made than to recommend the study of the modern instead of the ancient classics. We have seen that the study of a vernacular language cannot answer the same high purpose as the study of a foreign and fixed language. By no means can the study of modern works supersede the study of the ancient. The great modern works are great because they were written by men whose minds were formed by the study of the classics, or who lived among those so educated and were greatly influenced by them. To speak of our own great authors:—Milton is, to a great extent, the reflection of Homer, Æschylus and Euripides; of Virgil and Ovid. Milton received the exactest and fullest classical training, and it seems to have been his own delight, as we now count it his glory, to have reproduced to such a degree the marvellous force and beauty of classical antiquity. Shakespeare, on occasions, affected an acquaintance with classical antiquity, wrote

largely on classical themes, and appears to have acquired all that knowledge of the ancients which was possible for one in his circumstances, by reading our early versions of the classics and by his intimacy with Ben Jonson and others who were so familiar with classical antiquity. Spencer is redolent of classical lore, both from direct study and through the great Italian writers who were great classical scholars. Chaucer is supposed to have been bred at one of the Universities, and is full of Latin learning. So our great prose writers, Hooker, Taylor and Barrow, Bacon, Addison and Macaulay, were as eminent for their knowledge of Greek and Roman learning as they were distinguished for their achievements in the literature of their own language. Even Sir Walter Scott, the greatest ornament still of our fictitious literature, who was not unacquainted with classical literature, though his career at the University of Edinburgh was brief and imperfect, said in the greatness of his fame, as is well known, that he would give up one half of his literary reputation, if the other half might rest on a sound foundation of learning and scientific knowledge, and by learning he largely meant a knowledge of ancient literature. Burke and Fox were two of the greatest orators that Europe has ever seen, and how much the one owed to his classical training at the great Irish University, and how accurate was the acquaintance of the other with the great poets and prose writers of antiquity, is well known. And what is true of the English authors, is true of the great authors of other European nations. They had no other, nor greater models than the writers of classical antiquity, and not to understand and relish the great writers of antiquity, is not to comprehend the profound thoughts, nor perceive the exquisite beauty of the modern classics. And to the grammar and the lexicography of Greek and Latin, men of the greatest genius and sagacity and industry in modern times, have devoted their highest and best and most laborious efforts. It is a matter, not to be forgotten nor overlooked, that we possess facilities for mastering the ancient languages such as we have for no modern tongue; and thus would we study language to the best effect, we must study their tongues, thus furnished with an adequate apparatus. And the best grammars and dictionaries, even of modern languages, have been executed by those who have acquired their method and skill in the study of the classic tongues. It is remarkable that so little should have been done in the best manner towards a knowledge of the modern languages, but we may congratulate ourselves that



great scholars, armed with the panoply of antiquity, are now addressing themselves to the achievement of this task. Grimm, Diefenbach, Pott and Diez, are, or have been, laboring to supply our vast and deplorable deficiencies in the instruments whereby we can acquire an exact knowledge of the great living dialects. We have had, it may be, five hundred English grammars published in this country; but no one of them has well set forth the forms and combinations of our language. On the contrary, the generality of the views presented in them are erroneous and often positively pernicious in making a few strict rules to regulate the use of the language and restraining the glorious liberty of the English of Shakspeare and Jeremy Taylor within their paltry limits. Our language has been losing in richness and freedom the last hundred years immeasurably, and mainly through the teachings of those who in no sound and good sense can be said to know the usages of our language. The English have one grammar of more considerable reputation than any which we possess, viz., Latham's; but in the preparation of that work he drew his best materials from the German grammar of Jacob Grimm, who fitted himself for his task by the most careful study in the classical schools of his learned country. We have as yet no dictionary of the English language worthy of the name; and we have none simply because the materials for a good dictionary never have been collected. No man, no number of men, have as yet become so far acquainted with the English language and literature as to make it possible for us to have one. The effort now making in London to have the English literature of all periods studied by scholars in an orderly manner and the results communicated to a committee for revision, and the appointment of a number of competent persons to investigate the etymology of our language, is likely to issue in something worthy and of permanent value. It is not denied that we have vocabularies of English, that we have under the several words an attempt at etymology; but we have no dictionary of our language giving the etymology with exactness and fulness, and giving the primary meaning of the words and their various derived and actual meanings in their logical and historical order. Johnson and Richardson, Webster and Worcester, have done all they could and they are to be praised for this; but one needs only to take one of our standard authors and to sit down to the study of it with something of the thoroughness of the classical method and turn to these



dictionaries for a solution of the difficulties which occur in the etymology, the sense, or the syntax of a word, to see how little can be learned of the English language by consulting English dictionaries, in comparison with what we may know of Hebrew or Greek or Latin by a reference to Gesenius, to Passow, or to Freund. We have said that the languages of Italy, Spain, Portugal and France, were called Roman languages from the impress which the tongues of these nations received at the hands of their conquerors. These modern tongues have, it is true, in great measure lost the inflections of the Latin, and the relations once indicated by these inflections are now indicated by the freer use of particles, and the order of the words has become more fixed and unvarying; but the vocabularies of these languages is still in the main the same as in Latin, and he who has become familiar with the Latin can by learning certain changes of the letters, peculiar to each language, but very regular in each, easily master the vocabulary of any one or all of these tongues; and those who have studied or taught languages well know that the mastering of the vocabulary of a tongue is the most laborious task connected with this study. This would be a consideration in favor of the study of Latin in early life by any one likely at any time afterwards to take up the study of any or all of the Roman tongues. And even upon the study of German, in which language are stored up, beyond a doubt, the greatest and richest treasures of modern learning, the study of Latin has an important bearing. That language from the universal culture of its scholars, is fast becoming what our own has become from historical developments and contacts, a composite tongue. Very many words have been introduced by German scholars directly from the Latin language, and very many more from the Roman languages by contact with them or by the study of them and their literature; and all such words are easily recognized by the Latin scholars; while to one ignorant of Latin, this element adds another to the many and great difficulties of acquiring this language,—a language, the knowledge of which is more indispensable to a scholar than that of any other modern tongue, if he would avail himself of the best results of the researches of the best scholars or would become acquainted with the manner in which such researches are made.

Let us consider the connection between the learned professions and classic culture.

In the sacred profession a knowledge of Greek is indispensable if the clergyman would have a direct and exact acquaintance with the original documents of the Christian religion and with the most venerable version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, which was made at Alexandria in the third century before the Christian era, which has been in a great measure the foundation of all subsequent versions, and whose renderings no scholar fails to consider in his interpretation of the Old Testament. Not only in the Holy Providence of God was the Record of the Christian faith made in the Greek, but it was in that language that the profoundest and most acute discussions of the great verities of religion were made; so that it is scarcely too much to say, that we have received Christianity through the Greek mind as well as through the Greek language. The Latin language also gives us one of the two oldest existing versions of the New Testament, and of late years the ancient Latin version has been considered of such importance that it has been printed on the second page with the original Greek in some of the most critical editions, those of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and there are cases in which its authority is adduced by scholars side by side with that of the most ancient Greek MSS., in their endeavors to settle points in debate. Very many works illustrative of the language and the archaeology of the whole Bible, have been written in Latin and with such a fulness and accuracy of research that they have been never superseded, and perhaps never will be to such an extent that the true scholar can dispense with their acquaintance. These works are written in Latin that they might be accessible to the whole learned world, instead of being locked up in the language of some one of the modern nations; and even now when the knowledge of foreign tongues is much more common than it formerly was, learned works of great and universal interest to biblical students continue to be drawn up in the Latin language. And it is not to be forgotten that while we have some great Hebrew scholars among the Jews, who are unacquainted with classical learning, yet among Christians almost none proceed to the study of the Old Testament in the language in which it was written except from and after the study of Greek and Latin. The great dictionaries and grammars of the Hebrew language were made mostly by men of great classical acquirements, and the lexicographical and grammatical illustrations and contrasts are drawn, on the occidental side, mainly from the classic tongues.

Those who disparage learning in general and classical learning in particular, would do wisely to bear in mind that the common English version of the Holy Bible is the product of the greatest and exactest philological learning of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The English Bible is the print of those two illustrious nurseries of learning, the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford. It was John Reynolds a prodigy of learning, and especially of classical learning, at whose instance our present version was undertaken by the command of King James; it was he and Bishop Andrews, whose learning embraced a knowledge of fifteen tongues; and Geoffrey King, the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge; and William Bedwell the principal Arabic scholar of his time, and perhaps the first who greatly promoted the study of Arabic in Europe; and Edward Lively one of the very first Orientalists of his time; and John Hearn Professor of Greek at Oxford, a conspicuous Latinist, Grecian, and divine; and Miles Smith, afterward Bishop of Gloucester, to whom Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic were almost as familiar as his own tongue, and to whom with Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, the final examination and revision of the whole translation was committed;—it was these men and such as these who, incited, aided and guided by the Providence of God, gave us our English Bible, and all these, as scholars well know, were the selected Greek and Latin and oriental scholars of the learned age of one of the greatest and most learned nations of the world: and we submit whether it be not a matter of great ignorance or of great ingratitude in the reader and student of the English Bible now to say anything in disparagement of classical learning. The views of the great Reformers of our Holy Religion concerning the importance of philological science, which then meant the study of Greek, Latin and Hebrew, are well known. Luther said that true theology was grammar: Melancthon, that Scripture could be understood theologically only when it had been understood grammatically: Scaliger, at least the second of all the scholars the world has yet seen and perhaps the first, that the differences in religion sprang from ignorance of grammar. The Christian Religion being a matter of revelation to man in human language, the interpretation of those forms of language in which it was made becomes a matter of the very highest concern, and this reflection fully justifies those strong expressions of those old and wise theologians and scholars.

If we turn to the profession of medicine, we find that medical literature dates from the Greek physician Hippocrates, and that the first medical schools giving origin to the profession proper, were Greek: as those of Rhodes, Epidaurus, Chidus, and Cos. It was this last school that produced Herophilus, the founder of scientific anatomy and physiology, who discovered the anatomy of the nervous system, first demonstrated the functions of the motor and the sensitive nerves, and fixed the seat of thought in the brain. The Greek city of Pergamus was famous as a school of medicine, and still more famous for giving birth to Galen, the greatest name in medicine, whether in ancient or in modern times, whose works have had a more lasting and deeper influence on the profession than those of any other writer, and whose own standard of perfection in his art was higher than that of any other man and was approached by himself more nearly perhaps than by any one since his time. It was a Greek, Archagathus from the Peloponnesus who, as Pliny informs us, was the first purely professional medical man in Rome. The great founders and masters of medicine and surgery having been Greeks and the great medical treatises having been written in that language, the modern nomenclature of medicine and surgery is largely Greek, just as the modern terms of war in all cultivated languages are borrowed from the French; and those of music, from the Italians, by reason of the pursuits and attainments of these two nations respectively. Medicine then to know its own origin aright and to understand its own language well, must resort to the Greek language and literature.

The relation of Latin to the legal profession is one of great importance. The very existence of a State, which is worthy to be called a State depends on right: not right in the abstract, but right as embodied and made tangible by and in written law. It was the language of Rome that conveyed the legislation of the ancient civilized world into the modern. Roman law is the foundation of our present jurisprudence and upon it the law literature of modern nations is reared as a mere superstructure. This modern literature would be unintelligible by itself: and it would have no common nomenclature, if it abandoned the use of the Latin names and phrases. This Latin terminology of the profession is a matter familiar to all, but the dependence of the present literature of law upon the great Roman treatises, is not so generally known. We instance the *Pandects of Justinian*, which



pervade all the modern systems of law, and exercise an immense influence on the thoughts and actions of all nations that are living under the order and in the security of law;—a degree of order to which the repellant elements of human nature, even in its best condition, would seem impossible to be reduced; and a security, which to one contemplating man in his savage state would appear a mere dream of fond desire.

We have spoken of the connection between the learned professions and the study of Latin and Greek, as a matter of convenience and utility, and viewed in *some* light, even of necessity. There is another relation that they bear to the professions which is not to be disregarded; we mean that of association. For some centuries now the way to the professions has been through the study of the classics, and the knowledge of them has been considered indispensable to an adequate preparation for learned labor, whether the real bearing of these studies upon the professions was known and understood or not. This favorable regard for these studies remains almost without abatement; and while there have been cases of success in the practice of the profession without classic culture, these cases have been very rare and the obstacles to success without the ordinary preparation have been overcome by greater exertion, or by circumstances which very seldom combine in the case of any one man. But every wise and candid person will see and acknowledge that that course should be pursued which is commonly approved and successful rather than that which is commonly disapproved and which is successful only by exception.

Those who have studied the ancient classics longest and most thoroughly, have been, almost without a single exception in the annals of learning, the warm friends of these studies and the resolute defenders of the claims they have upon the attention of all who have anything to do, or would have anything to do, with higher education. This, it must be conceded, is very weighty testimony on their behalf. And the opposition which has been made to the studies and the objections which have been urged against them, have proceeded from those who were utterly ignorant of them or had studied them carelessly and to little effect. There are also those who have objected to the study of them in preparation for the professions, because they have taken low and sordid views of the professions. They regard a profession just as they would a trade where a certain amount of information



and mechanical skill is requisite to do a certain kind of work. This is a very false and unworthy view to take of the professions, which by common consent of men are designated as *the learned professions*, and the preparation for them, a *liberal course of study*. The labor of the professions is of the highest and most difficult kind, and those who practice the professions are commonly the leaders in human society. Hence if a young man be destined for a handicraft, you may, if you will train him to do just that particular work, and if that be all you require, it will be done well by such a person so trained, just as a machine does its work well. But if you would educate him as a man, bring out his humanity, prepare him to do excellently in some one high sphere in life and well in all his relations, you must employ in the course of his education those means which the wisest men have used for this purpose, and which they have used with the best results.

Latin, as we have seen, may well be studied for the benefit arising to one who wishes afterward to study the principal tongues of modern Europe; Greek will be of great advantage to one who is to pursue the study of the material sciences, the nomenclature of which brings in great measure Greek, and the understanding of the terms of any science contributing in a most important way to an exact knowledge of the science itself. And it is a great mistake to suppose that the time devoted to a proper study of Latin and Greek in schools, is in any case wasted. Those who have had actual experience in the matter, well know that between two young minds of the same natural ability, one of which has been employed exclusively with English and the sciences, and the other with these studies and the classics, there is a vast advantage on the side of the boy who has studied the classics. The former is rude and unrefined and untutored in comparison; and again and again has it not been proved by those engaged in the business of instruction that the boy who studies the classics will also enter the English and scientific lists and surpass the latter on their own exclusive ground. What more splendid tribute could be paid to the classics than to set forth this fact that the clever and diligent student in the classics, can also attend to the sciences and the English with better results than his companion who is pursuing the latter exclusively? And we believe that the student who is eminent in his classics, can, in almost all instances, be eminent in science. The distinguished scholars of the English

Universities and our own Colleges are commonly distinguished in the classics and in science, and the very highest honors at graduation can scarcely be attained without high attainment in both. The mere mathematician often despises linguistic attainments, and consequently it is no uncommon thing to find eminent mathematicians with but scanty power of language and sometimes even stating their problems with a degree of ambiguity which makes the author's meaning quite uncertain without two trials of his problem to determine what he meant. But we do not advocate the study of Greek and Latin without special reference to the manner in which it is done. Yet a distinguished member of the legal profession, once said to us that he believed the simple and greatly unaided study of the forms of the Latin language, produced a very important effect on a boy's mind in making him attentive and discriminating, and that he had witnessed in the case of the lads serving him in his daily labors, a manifest advantage on the part of all those who had studied Latin over those who had not. We were glad to hear this recommendation even of the incompetent teaching and defective study of Latin. But we are by no means satisfied with this, and would have no one else satisfied with it. We think that the classics should be taught by the best men possible in the best manner possible. We think that this study should be pursued with all those advantages which are enjoyed in other departments of learning. There has been as great an advance in the method and apparatus of classical teaching during the last twenty-five years as in any other department of instruction whatever. We have new grammars and new dictionaries, embodying facts before unknown, and correcting many errors which had long passed for facts; new editions of the classic authors themselves, presenting the text in greater purity than ever before, all giving an increased effect to these studies. And with this greatly improved literary apparatus, we now have, as indeed we ought, teachers advanced in learning far beyond those we had a few years ago. Our Colleges, particularly our older ones, where the standard is, and easily can be, much higher than in our new institutions in newly settled parts of our country, year by year graduate classes in which young men can be found suitable in every way to undertake this work, and if we do not employ them, the fault is our own.

We would also now have the comparative method introduced in the study of language. We would not have a lan-

guage taught by itself, but supposing the learner to begin with Latin, as we have shown above to be expedient, every lesson in Latin should also be a lesson in English, every lesson in Greek should also be a lesson in English and Latin, and as soon as French and German are begun, we would add a constant reference also to these tongues. We would compare the words of the different languages under view, the similarity or dissimilarity of the phrases of these languages, and so have the pupil's knowledge of one and another language advance together, aided and confirmed by every new fact of what language soever he knew. It is manifest how much greater his interest will be in knowledge which he does not merely acquire, but actually uses; and how much clearer will be his apprehension of what he views under so much reflected light. And so far from opposing or discouraging the formal study of English in a liberal course of education, we would advocate most earnestly the systematic and thorough study of our own great authors in our classical schools. Whatever acquaintance can be made with them in a mere English school, a far deeper knowledge of them can be acquired in conjunction with the ancient classics. We would have Bacon and Milton, Chaucer and Spenser, studied side by side with Cicero, Virgil, Horace, and Homer. Any classical school competently conducted can admit these authors into its course of study and give its pupils a good introduction to them by devoting a weekly and semi-weekly lesson to them, and the beginning thus worthily made can be followed by higher and more critical study under the Professor of English Literature in College. Such a course of study, so begun at school, produced a Coleridge, whose critical and extensive knowledge of the English language and literature, was one of the most splendid of the many splendid ornaments that adorned his great mind; such a course of study begun at school, but prolonged as a voluntary occupation through life, gave us Charles Lamb, a name admired and loved as well as pitied, wherever English literature is known; such a course of study has produced a host of other honored scholars and writers in England, and such a course pursued here will lead to noble results among us. No where can our great old English authors and their worthy successors of recent times, themselves filled, heart and mind, with classic love, be so well-understood as in the classical school, interpreted by the classical master. By his long and severe philological training, he will be best able to solve the difficulties of their language;

and those difficulties which are as yet unresolvable, he will leave unresolved. Appreciating a real difficulty, he modestly and wisely waits for the means of arriving at a real solution, while the less thoroughly educated man perceives no difficulty, or seeing a Gordian knot rudely and hastily cuts what he wants the patience and the sagacity to undo.

It must be borne in mind that literature and learning in general best flourish where the classics are long and assiduously and critically studied, and that literature grows worthless and learning decays, as the classics are neglected. It is Germany, England, and America that are now producing the healthiest and best literature, and it is in these countries that the classics are now best studied. Many causes have conspired to deprive France of the benefits of classic culture, and the inferior character of her literature, except that which relates to the mere physical interests of man, is notorious. Learning of all kinds is well nigh dead in all the other Roman nations. A comparison of the different parts of our own country, affords an illustration of the fact we are considering. Nowhere in our country have the classics received such attention as in New England; and that is precisely the position of our country which has confessedly been most distinguished for general education, for learning of the highest order, and for the most important contributions to literature in perhaps every department but medicine; while there are parts of our country distinguished for wealth and material, where classical study is little pursued, and literary activity is almost utterly unknown; and there are many of our cities, eminent for their mechanical activity and for their development and use of physical resources, which disregarding the claims of these higher studies, have produced scarcely one important work in letters. And it will be found to be almost universally true that where the higher forms of education do not receive earnest and careful attention, all the lower and more practical forms are greatly neglected or are attended to with but little success. This is a fact deserving consideration from those who would banish the study of the classics from the curriculum of education on the ground that this study consumes time and energy which might better be given to matters of a more directly practical bearing. Banish the classics from our schools and then all other studies will be pursued with less interest because pursued with less thoroughness. Whatever subjects are taught, to be taught well, must



be taught by the best educated teachers who have themselves passed through the longest course with the greatest care. The more they know themselves and the more fully and critically they know it, the greater will be their demand upon their pupils, the greater their own ability to meet that demand, and the worthier example of activity and culture will they set before those under their charge. That we are easily and greatly influenced by example is just as true in matters of education as in anything else. As a general thing, pupils even of the rarest ability will not do more and will not do better than their instructor even when the instructor is a man of meagre talents and still more meagre education. But, on the other hand, it will awaken in almost all pupils an ambition to do their very best, when they have continually before them one whose attainments are of a high and generous order and who has made those attainments in the same way he is making out for them to pursue.

We have written what we have on behalf of the study of the ancient classics, at the request of one of our Lutheran friends, for this Lutheran Quarterly. We pray Almighty God that this great, pious, and learned communion may not only retain, but increase, the greatness, piety, and learning which so peculiarly befit the honored name they bear; and especially that they may now and ever be the hearty and generous supporters of that classical learning which seems to have been at once the root and the offshoot of the Reformation, that learning of which the Germans, the countrymen or forefathers of so many of our American Lutherans, have made themselves the masters to such a degree that all other nations must, and do sit at their feet as learners; that learning which the Germans, having made the basis of their great and most varied culture, have become the teachers of all things else to the world; that learning which the great and good Luther honored by pursuing it himself and which he so delighted to encourage and honor in the persons of his illustrious co-workers, whether in Church or State.



## ARTICLE IV.

## THE GERMAN LANGUAGE.

By Prof. J. W. NEVIN, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

In offering a plea for the study of the German Language it seems proper to say something in the first place on the nature of language in general for the purpose of showing in what view particularly it deserves to be made in any case an object of study.

Language, it is now understood, stands in the most intimate and vital connection with thought. The relation between the two is like that which holds between the soul and the body. It is not outward and mechanical merely, but inward and organic. Thought, for man, becomes real and complete only in the form of word. It has been made a question, whether language is to be considered of human or divine origin, an invention of man or a supernatural communication from God. But the argument has been so managed commonly on both sides as to involve a contradiction, by assuming that there might be a development of mind to some extent without the use of speech. The supposition has been that mind could exist as conscious intelligence in the first place, and then have the benefit of speech added to it, either by its own contrivance, or as a new special gift from the Almighty. But no such supposition can be allowed; and no theory of the origin of language founded upon it, either in one or the other of these views, is entitled to any sort of consideration or respect. It is a grand mistake at once in regard to the nature of language, to imagine that it is required simply as an instrument for the communication of thought. It belongs to the very life of thought itself, and is of one birth with it from the beginning. It is no invention of man; no outward gift of God; but part and practice of the rational nature itself with which man was originally endowed by his Maker. It is in this respect both human and divine in its origin, in the sense of the general declaration: There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding. Speech is a constituent part of the being which God gave man, when he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life in the beginning, and made man to become a living soul.

The power of thinking, and the power of speaking, are different sides only of one and the same development of created mind or spirit. The two forms of life are in their ground identical. To think, is to speak, to body forth intelligence, mentally at least, in the form of word. Language is needed not simply for the communication of thought but for its very existence. The workings of the soul continue altogether dark and chaotic, till they are brought to take concrete shape by means of speech.

Under this view, language is itself of a living, spiritual nature. It is not made up in any case of a multitude of parts, brought together in a purely external way. It is not the outward shrine merely of the life it serves to represent, but the actual presence of this life itself, just as the body is the presence of our animating soul.

Every particular language thus is organic; has a life of its own; is a whole within itself; forms within itself a peculiar world or sphere, answerable to the inward nature and being of the people to whom it belongs. The different languages that exist in the world are the types of as many different confirmations of mind, into which the general life of the human race has come to be cast. If it be asked, why there should be so many tongues among men instead of one, answering to the common unity of the race, we have only to ask again in reply, why the general life of mankind should itself be found branching out into as many different forms and phases of existence as there are varieties of speech in the world. The one fact is simply the counterpart of the other. The life of the race is collectively one; but the full sense of it is brought out only by the means of its division into races and nations, each representing in its own way, not the whole, but some portion simply, of the general idea of humanity. Hence, as we say the multiplication of tongues, answering to these manifold forms of existence; all comprehended in the same power of speech, and yet all having their own separate character and constitution. For the difference between language is never one simply of mere outward sound; it extends to their entire inward spirit. They belong to different worlds of human development; they are part and parcel separately of different orders of thought, different modes of spiritual existence.

No two languages are alike, in such sense that a mere change of corresponding words and terms may be considered all that is necessary to convert them into one. There is never any such correspondence as that between the life of one people

and the life of another. The life of every people is a distinct whole belonging exclusively to itself, the result of all special influences, physical, social and historical, under which it has been developed from the beginning. It holds in this way throughout in a world which is altogether its own, and which it refuses to share or make common with the life of any other people whatever. And just so it is with the languages, which the different nations of men speak. They are of one growth and form with the life they serve in each case to represent. They are the concrete expression at all points of the distinguishing mind and thought of the nations that use them. They differ from one another thus in a constitutional and universal way. Every language is a world within itself—a home of the human spirit, as it is to be encountered and communed with nowhere else.

It is easy to see how, in this view, a language becomes itself regulative and determining for the inward history of the people by whom it is spoken. An organic outbirth in the first place of their peculiar life, it serves at once to bound and define at the same time the way in which this life must go on to unfold itself to the end. It belongs to the very conception of language that it should be a distinct living creation within itself, a mode of apprehending the world different from all other modes; and being of such character it must necessarily become, in every case, a standing normative rule or type for all the thinking and working of those among whom it is in daily living use. The language into which children are born and bred, is an educational engine, or rather a plastic power of irresistible force, which goes to shape their being from the beginning as no force besides; and long as they may live, from generation to generation, it is a power from which they can never make their escape. In a profound sense, men may be said to live, move and have their being, in the world that is made to be about them by their mother tongue. Language in this way everywhere determines intelligence and controls thought. Words to a wonderful extent, constituting the very spirit and life of things; and forms of speech are at the same time modes of conception and forms of actual knowledge.

What we now say does not conflict, of course, with the idea of improvement, enlargement, cultivation and growth in the language of a people as well as in their general life. On the contrary, it lies in the very nature of the organic character which we ascribe to all language, that it should show

itself everywhere and under all forms capable of such progressive development to an indefinite extent. The same nation may exhibit in different ages immensely different measures of cultivation; and there may be no comparison between its rudeness of speech in one period and its wealth of words in another. But with all this, the determining necessity of which we are now speaking will be found to remain throughout always the same; there will be no breaking away on the part of the language from its original ground and constitution; it will carry in itself to the end the law of its own development, and be at the same time thus a governing power for the development of the entire life to which it belongs. The twig may rise into a sapling, and grow finally to be a giant oak, having yet always the same life, whose identity is unalterably fixed through all changes of figure and volume by the mysterious law of its own being; and just so it is possible for a language to pass through all manner of changes, involving corresponding changes of national culture, while it continues steadfastly true, notwithstanding to the type or confirmation of thought from which it has sprung in the beginning. There may be growth and expansion to any extent; but it is expansion always after a certain order and kind, and according to a certain organic law. Thought is free and creative in the movement, but not with absolute independence; it must act in the direction, and within the range and scope also, of the general life in which it is embosomed.

It is not only then by the measure of their culture at any given time, that the comparative worth of different languages is to be determined. Very much depends also on their original constitution. Some languages are better than others by virtue of their very nature, independently of all development; just as some races and tribes of men are better than others, not simply for what they may have already become in the actual history of the world, but for what they have the capacity and power of becoming from the beginning. A comparatively rude speech may in this way be richer than one that is highly polished, as carrying in itself the possibility of a better order of thought. In estimating the claims of a language to consideration and respect, we are to take into view, of course, its literature, its historical contents, what we may call the volume of its actual life; but along with this, regard must be had also to its inward structure and genius. The main difference between languages lies in this, that they form within themselves different worlds



of mind, different versions, we may say, of the human spirit — the exploration of which is to be counted of worth, more or less, for its own sake, no less than as being a mode of access simply to something else, a medium of communication with knowledge and learning under other forms.

It is only when we look at the subject in this way, that we are prepared to understand at all the true importance of the study of languages. Rightly taken, no study can be less mechanical, less simply outward and formal. It is not a matter of memory merely, mastering the rules and examples of a grammar or the words of a dictionary. A language consists not just of the syllables and words, of which it is composed, but still more of the living mind which enters into them, and finds in them its proper habitation and home. The words of a nation are that nation's life and spirit. To master the language of a people, is at the same time to enter into their spirit, and to become acquainted with their mind and character as they can never be known in any other way.

Language is logic. Reason enters into all its forms. Its grammatical and syntactical elements include in themselves everywhere necessary relations and conditions of thought. The very process of mastering them in the way of study, is a development of intelligence, an educational opening and strengthening of mind, a bringing out of the resources and powers of the spirit in new form. Such study is not the work of memory merely, a mechanical instrumentation for something coming after itself; it is in the fullest sense of the term a direct exercise of the whole thinking nature, which in and of itself serves to give it enlargement and freedom. In this view, there is no more important branch of study for the education of the young; no discipline more necessary for the natural and wholesome unfolding of their intellectual powers.

But the benefit of such study goes beyond this. In the view just stated, that the language of every people is the key to their inmost life, the only door of full, effectual introduction into the spiritual world in which they have their being, it is easy to see how the knowledge of a new tongue serves at once to impart new compass and force to all other forms of knowledge that go to make up the idea of true human culture. By entering in this way into a new order of existence, we experience new comprehensiveness of thought and observation, which extend itself to all departments of



our knowledge, all spheres of our intellectual life. Art, philosophy, morality, religion, history, acquire a new sense, become more catholic, more full, more free. The whole horizon of thought is enlarged, and along with this all things are brought to show themselves in new relations and aspects.

The history of a nation, its manners and customs, its modes of thinking, its literature and religion, its political institutions, become fairly intelligible, only when they are studied through the medium of its own speech. They can never be fully understood by means of any translation. Whatever knowledge there may seem to be of them in this way must always be more or less visionary and superficial. The mind that lives in a language is not to be apprehended by simple report. It is not enough for us to be told in our own speech, what men of a different speech have thought, and spoken, and done. All we get in that way is only dead representation; which then becomes animated for us after a fashion again by a new spirit put into it from ourselves, through which it was made to be materially different from its original nature. The life of a foreign people, thus forced to pass over into our sphere of thinking, is in fact cast into a new mould, and becomes *our* life, not theirs. To understand any such life properly, the process must be reversed; we must quit our own sphere, and pass over ourselves into the foreign world in which it has its true and only proper home. In other words, we must commune with it in its own language. There it meets us in its actual, concrete shape and form. There it has its own complexion, its own expression. There first it becomes intelligible; and there only is it, that, being studied in this way, its literature, history, legislation, science and social life, begin also first to show themselves in their true light. The key to the inmost sense of all, is offered to us in the spirit of the nation corporealized and made permanent in its language.

Every new language then that the student masters, it would seem, serves to make his intellectual existence more large and free. This is the object of all true culture. The man who has never got beyond the bounds of his own first life, makes this necessarily the measure of all truth. The particular in such narrow view is for him the absolute and universal; and he is ready to set down all beyond as entitled to no regard. But such narrowness, we know, is itself the character of a rude, uncultivated nature; and the first law of

education is, that what is thus single and particular in thought should be widened into what is broad and comprehensive in thought, taking in as much as possible the life of the world at large, and not simply our own life. In this view we speak of a *liberal* education, and of the liberal arts and sciences—meaning to express in this way the common sense of what in the end all genuine human training requires, emancipation namely from the bondage of the individual into the freedom of the general. Hence also such culture has been distinguished as *humane*, and the studies contributing to it have been called, by a striking title, the *humanities*. All that tends to enlarge a man's acquaintance with the life of the world, the sense of humanity in its universal view, may be considered as entering into the conception of this discipline. Travelling, reading generally, and the study of history in particular, are well adapted to serve here an important end. But in no way is such liberalization and humanization of mind more effectually helped than by the proper study of languages different from our own; for this, by the very nature of the case, involves an actual entering into the interior spirit of nations, where without it all our knowledge of them, either through travelling or history, must be, as it were, on the outside of their real being. To enter a new language is to pass into a new world of thought, and thus to transcend the previous limits of the mind's existence. The knowledge of humanity, of history, of life in its wholeness, is made larger. By the mastery of foreign tongues, we enter foreign systems of intelligence, and see the world under new aspects and form new points of view. Our being is in this way multiplied and made more manifold.

It is with good reason, therefore, that the study of Latin and Greek is made to enter as largely as it does into the idea of a liberal education. Complaint is heard frequently that it is a waste of time and strength to hold boys so long to what is considered to be at best a preparation only for something else, a mere door of introduction to the literature of past ages, which is all made accessible to us now in other ways. But the complaint proceeds always upon a mistaken notion of the nature and object of such study. Its uses go far beyond this mechanical purpose. No discipline can be more important for its own sake. In no other way could the time given to it be so productively employed for the ends of a truly liberal culture. It is, after all that may be said, the

shortest method of attaining well-grounded knowledge in the arts and sciences generally—the only royal road, we may say, to full scholarship and learning in any view. So it has been felt in the history of Universities and Colleges from the beginning; and the judgment is not likely, we presume, to be soon set aside by modern innovation, however plausibly directed against it. The attempts which are made for this purpose betray their own weakness commonly through that very deficiency in themselves, which it is their object to fasten on education generally; and in this way serve in the end to strengthen the cause, which they are fanatically bent on overthrowing. The real difficulty with our Academies and Colleges here, is not that they make too much account of Greek and Latin studies; but that they fail to make the prosecution of them sufficiently full and thorough. If there be any one fact well established in the history of mind, it is that just these studies, and no others, are to be regarded as central and fundamental for the whole idea of free, classical education: and that any attempt therefore to push them out of the way deserves to be stigmatized as sciolism and radicalism, in the world of letters, of the very worst form.

So deeply convinced are we indeed of the general truth of what we now say, that if we had power we would organize all higher education for females also on the same foundation principle; making the study of the Latin language at least, the ground work and chief pillar of all it might be thought proper to include in it besides. We do not imagine of course, that the sexes require the same kind of education: and the notion that they should be placed in the same collegiate seminaries and classes—the so-called *co-education* of the sexes as we have it insisted upon in certain quarters—we consider to be itself a fanatical monstrosity, only too near akin to the reformatory zeal which would banish from our schools the study of the Greek and Roman classics. As the nature of woman is different from that of man, she requires also a different training to develop her powers and perfect her interior life. But this development, in our order, ought to be vigorous and free, no less than that which it is sought to reach in a different way for the other sex; and for that purpose, we are firmly persuaded, the best possible discipline here, as in the other case, is offered to us in the study of the dead languages. We are willing to limit the culture in the case of females to the use of one of these tongues, namely the Latin; which we would then have, however, effectually mastered

from the grammar upwards and onwards, so as to include the reading of considerable portions of the best literature that has come down to us in this form. This must of course interfere with much else, that now figures in the ambitious "courses of study" put forth by our fashionable *Ladies' Seminaries*; where all the "ologies" are held up to dazzle the popular fancy, in full emulation of a four years' college course for young men. But this would give us no concern. We have no faith in these curricular programmes. They are gotten up in the most loose and desultory way, without any scientific judgment whatever. They are notoriously for show and effect. They labor under a double absurdity; half the studies embraced in them are inapplicable to the idea of female culture under any circumstances, as much so as the pitching of quoits or the wearing of pantaloons; and then such as they are, all life is squeezed out of them, by the artificial compression that is necessarily employed to make them small enough for such feminine use. What can well be more dry and dreary than the literary skeletons, to which the different sciences have been reduced, mainly through the art of New England, for the benefit of hapless boarding school girls in this way! To a thoughtful mind, there is a measure of irony in the very nomenclature of these patent rostrums for putting knowledge into the female mind. Text-books on Logic, Rhetoric, Psychology, Political Economy, Aesthetics, Geology, all sorts of Philosophy, and such like sounding titles; text-books, made up for the most part of dry definitions, abstract formulas, and fleshless generalizations, from beginning to end; what good purpose, in the name of all common sense, can they be expected to serve in the education of our daughters! Of all educational quackeries among us, the most wholesale and sad, we verily believe, is our reigning system of Young Ladies' boarding schools and Seminaries. They need to be completely revolutionized; and we do not feel it to be any objection, therefore, to what we now say of making the Latin language the basis of female education, that this must necessarily change the whole form and fashion of it as it now stands. That precisely, of all other things, is just what we should hold it a felicity to be able to bring to pass.

The power of reading Virgil in his own tongue, and the fact of having done so with proper intelligence, would be worth more, we are very sure, for the mental culture of a young lady, than having by heart the whole contents of four-



fifths of the text books, by which it is now pretended to initiate young Misses in their teens into the mysteries of all modern science. *Things*, you say, ought to be learned, rather than words. But what if your things, as you call them, are after all dry technicalities only, loose facts, barren generalizations, having in them no spirit of life, whatever, but dinged into the memory in the most dead and mechanical way? And have you yet to learn that words, rightly taken, *are* things—things in the deepest and most vital sense of the term? No possible memorization of things as they are exhibited in these boarding school manuals can ever so awaken thought, or so stir into action the true life of mind, as it is possible for this to be done by an honest and faithfully mastery of the Latin language. Slow as the process may appear, it is always in fact the shortest and surest way to an effectual acquirement of knowledge in other forms; not singly by reason of what it is directly, as a strengthening discipline for the mind, but because of the relations also which it holds indirectly to such other branches of knowledge. In no other way, within the same time, can a young lady learn so well to understand and use her own language. In no other way can she master so thoroughly, its orthography, its etymology, its syntax. It will amount for her to more than years of logic, rhetoric, and grammar, studied as they are commonly in female schools. It will be her best qualification for geography and her best introduction to history. It will be to her more than volumes of travel, through foreign lands, or up and down the centuries of time, accomplished in other form. In no way besides can she lay the same foundation for sound judgment or good taste. As for the *philosophies*, she can afford to dismiss them without a sigh; unless it be one of pitying compassion for the innocent victims of the common boarding school system, who are doomed to follow after the shadow of learning in this most hapless and useless of all methods.

But our introduction, we find, is in danger of leaving but small room for what was intended to be the main theme of our article; although it will be found, we trust, to have an important bearing on its discussion. Our proper business at present is not to insist upon the educational value of the Latin language, but to urge rather the claims of the German, as being among modern tongues the most worthy of attention for English students, especially in this country.

We do not believe, with the learned Goropius, that the



German language was spoken by Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden. That is pressing its antiquity and independence rather too far. But there is a view, in which its origin does deserve to be made a matter of note and consideration. Among all the cultivated languages of modern Europe it is distinctively an aboriginal tongue to borrow one of its own pregnant terms, an *Ursprache*, a primitive speech, and not one of mixed origin and construction. It is not meant by this, that it is strictly autochthonic, a creation out of nothing older than itself. We know, by the light of Comparative Philology, that like a number of other ancient tongues, (Persian, Greek, Latin,) it owes its birth to the prolific womb of the old Oriental Sanscrit. It belongs to what is styled the Indo-Germanic family of languages. But however it may have started, it presents itself to us as a purely native growth throughout from its own proper root. It is the original Teutonic tongue as it was brought at first from Asia to Europe. The other nations of Europe generally did not hold fast their original speech in the same way. They became mixed with older populations, and fell thus into the use of new forms of language. Hence it is that the languages of modern Europe generally are of a composite character. The modern Italian, Spanish, French and Portuguese, are composed chiefly of Latin words, much altered however both in orthography and inflections. Celtic in their origin, they are made up, to a very great extent, now of material brought into them in this way from a foreign life. The English is based on the old Saxon, through which it is closely allied with the Teutonic and Gothic; but has also admitted into itself a large admixture of foreign element. These mixed tongues are indeed still organic, having in themselves a law which determines throughout the form of their life. The elements that enter into their composition are there in an inward and not simply outward way. But still such composition must necessarily detract something from the unity and force, the wholeness and fulness, of a language, considered in its own nature; and it is saying much in favor of the German, therefore, when we are able to claim for it the advantage of being primitive and pure in opposition to all miscegenation of this sort. Its life is emphatically its own. Like the free and hardy race whose spirit is mirrored in its tones and forms, it has in all ages refused to bend its neck to a foreign yoke. In this respect it is as native to itself as the

Greek, which it resembles indeed at all points more than any other modern tongue.

The language, however, might be thus primitive, and yet deserve no regard. No one is concerned to study a rude, uncivilized tongue for its own sake. But how far the German of the present day is removed from this character, no one need to be told. It did not indeed perfect itself so soon as the other modern tongues just named. Their mixed nature was perhaps, within certain limits, favorable to their progress. In due time, however, the German came up with them in the course of cultivation; and it may be said to have reached now, in its own order, a full and ripe development. It has flung its branches far and wide, and covered itself with boundless foliage and fruit. Through various fortunes, it has been advanced finally to the completeness of an Augustan age, and in the wealth of its literature may justly challenge comparison, to say the least, with any other language belonging to the civilization of Modern Europe.

As an *Ursprache*, thus organically complete within itself, the language is, as regards matter, uncommonly full and rich. The time has been indeed when it was the fashion to stigmatize it as poor in this view, in comparison more particularly with the courtly verbosity of the French. But that time is past. The speech of Paris is now known to be poverty itself, in comparison with the speech of Berlin. While the French is said to comprise about twenty eight thousand words, it has been reckoned that there are in the German not less than eighty thousand. One writer carries the number six times as high, and places it at half a million; and the truth is, it is not easy to say where a computation of this kind for such a language as the German should stop. The modifications of meaning which words are made to assume in it, by inflection, position, combination, and production, cannot easily be specified. The language, in this respect, carries in itself the capacity and power of indefinite extension.

In stem words, as they are called, the German does indeed fall far behind the French. But this itself belongs to its wealth. The German has few roots, because it is original and self-produced. Its ground is wholly within itself. The French on the other hand, has a large amount of independent elementary material, just because its life is of a mixed character, and made up largely of terms and forms that have been brought into it from abroad. A multitude of its words

stand as roots, simply because they have no ground in the language beyond themselves, but are of altogether foreign origin and birth; for which reason also, they can never be otherwise than comparatively sterile and unproductive. The French language is wanting in richness from this very fact, that its stem words are so multitudinous as compared with the general body of speech to which they belong.

And hence it is also, by the way, that it must ever be a difficult language to learn, for all who have not been trained to the use of it from childhood. However easy it may be to get such a smattering of it as is common in fashionable boarding schools, its multiplicity of primary terms, and the want of fixed analogies binding the universal tongue together as a single whole, render it a very considerable task always to master it in any full and thorough manner. The German, with its boundless sea of words, is by no means so hard to learn. Its roots are not numerous. Its forms of derivation and composition are regular and fixed. Words are held to their sense, by virtue of the common life that runs through the language as a whole. Let only the sphere of this life, the genius of the language, be properly apprehended, and it becomes a comparatively easy thing to follow it out afterwards in its organic development, no matter how far this may be extended.

The German language owes its wealth of words mainly to its constitutional power of expansion. This unfolds itself especially in two forms, boundless composition and endless derivation. Words of all sorts can be joined together with the most perfect ease, far beyond all that is possible in any other modern tongue, so as to give new terms corresponding in sense with the conjunction. Almost every word again, by prefixes and suffixes of invariable force, can be made to shoot forth into a whole tree of derivatives, by which its meaning is modified in all conceivable ways. The Greek language is distinguished for this power of self-enlargement. No other ancient tongue possessed the same expansibility; and for this reason it surpasses all others in fulness and freedom. The only modern tongue that can be compared with it in this respect, is the German. Truly, a proud distinction. So far as derivation is concerned, the German is supposed to go even beyond the Greek. Our English tongue, in its old Saxon forms especially, possesses to a certain extent the same advantage; but not by any means in the measure of the German. The French language has very little power of

expansion in this way. It seems to press everywhere on fixed and established limits. It cannot compound with any sort of freedom. Many of its primary words, as we have seen, are entirely barren, while such as are not so are fruitful only in a small degree. No fixed and universal analogies rule the business either of composition or derivation. All is arbitrary, irregular, more or less cold and stiff. The superiority of the German is shown by contrast at all points.

"Our language," says Franz Horn, "is one of free origin, springing directly out of our nature. It is firmly fixed in its root, which is immovable as necessity itself; but its blossoms and fruits are eternally manifold and young. Our language is rich; not like a well-stored cabinet of artificial curiosities, but rich as the spiritual nature of man himself, and like this susceptible of indefinite improvement. It cannot, so far as matter is concerned, be ended and bounded in as a finished system, in the way of languages of unfree constitution; but throws itself open always to the service of true genius, with ever-new life, wherever utterance is required for new thoughts and feelings." The French on the contrary, he tells us, boasts of being shut up and completed, the great point being, since the age of Louis XIV, to maintain its boundaries inviolated; so that writers of spirit have to complain of not being able to say what they would, by reason of the restraints put upon them by their language.

To make full account of the rich material contents of the German language, we must add the consideration of the vitality which enters into all, in virtue of what we have now seen to be its general constitution. All languages embody life in themselves; but not by any means in the same measure and degree. The life of one may be much more vital, so to speak, more inward and deep, than the life of another. Take for example here again the French; its mixed character, and prevaillingly mechanical construction, serve to throw its life as it were to the surface; so that it has come to be proverbially distinguished for a sort of outward sprightliness and vivacity, showing the want of true vitality rather than its presence. In broad contrast with this, the German is emphatically a living language; and the life which belongs to it may be said to penetrate and pervade it at every point. It is the free, spontaneous utterance everywhere of the mind it serves to represent. Its words are full of fresh sense and feeling. They have in them, in a certain way, the very breath of life. They are spiritual transcripts from



the things they are employed to express. The language is throughout the result of self-evolution, organic development from within. No part of it is dead ; no portion without the spirit which animates the whole.

In the French language, an unnatural divorce prevails between the upper and lower orders of mind. They are not held together by the bond of a common life. The language of literature and polite society does not grow forth from the language which is spoken by the mass of the people. It forms a sort of caste within itself. A multitude of perfectly honest words it may not touch for fear of defilement, simply because they are of current popular use ; and so in turn, the common people have no power to understand it, while it is made to suffer seriously at the same time both in ease and freedom. The German knows nothing of any such separation. The language of the school and the court, only in more cultivated form, is the language also of the most common walks of life. No honest word is frowned out of good company, simply because it may be in use among the rabble. An active communion thus is kept up continually between the literature and the general spirit of the nation. The first proceeds directly from the second, and draws fresh life from it always, as do the leaves and blossoms of a mighty tree from the branches which serve to join them with the trunk.

The constitution of the German language as now described, gives it peculiar depth and force. Where all is thus full of life, all will be full of power. The French is characteristically different ; it lacks inwardness, has no depth, but excess rather in qualities that are superficial, external and mechanical, in capacity of polish, in smooth volubility and airy lightness. The German in comparison has been counted heavy and rough. But we may say of it, "The king's daughter is all glorious within." The glory of the language lies in its spirituality and profound inward strength.

The most powerful use of the English tongue, it is admitted, is that in which Saxon words are properly employed in preference to such as are of foreign origin. Such words root themselves directly in the general life of the language, and for this reason have a depth and inwardness of meaning for the English mind, which can never belong to any corresponding terms derived from a different source. They are felt to be nearer than any other sort of words to the very nature of things, the substance and soul of what they are intended to



express- They serve to render style compact, nervous, racy and full of spirit; while high sounding periods made up largely of terms borrowed from the Latin, after the manner for example of Dr. Johnson, are found to be in comparison tedious and weak. Much of the force and beauty that belong to our English translation of the Bible must be referred to its prevailing Saxon phraseology; and how far it would be shorn of its excellence by a change of character in this respect, any one may easily see who will take the trouble to substitute almost any where terms of Latin origin for the text as it now stands. The Latin may sound larger; but it will mean less, and can never carry with it for readers generally the same life and force.

But what this native stock of Saxon words is for the English language in part, the entire body of its words and forms is for the German in whole. Here, as we have seen, all is native material. The language throughout is of home origin and home growth. Words are everywhere born as it were of the life they are made to represent. Forms of speech are at once forms of thought. No modern tongue can rival in this respect the capacity of the German for strong, deep, inward utterance and expression.

It stands univalued also in freedom and flexibility. The French is more elastic, and seems to possess more facility of motion; but its liberty in this way is bound to what must be counted still after all a partial and circumscribed sphere. It lacks universality. It is difficult to make translations into it from other languages. French translations are generally loose paraphrases, in which the sense and spirit of the original are more or less sacrificed. Voltaire went so far indeed as to say, that what could not be put into French must be void of literary worth; making his own tongue the measure of all good intelligence for the world. But the world may be excused for thinking otherwise; and the fact that Homer and Plato cut a poor figure in French will hardly be considered generally their fault. It can be counted only a defect in the French language itself. Tried by the same test, the German is found to be the most free and universal of all living tongues. No other is so supple, so pliant, so ready to yield to the plastic force of thought, under whatever form it may be required to give it body and motion. It has all the quietest flexibility of the ancient Greek. Translations are made into it from all other languages with wonderful ease and accuracy. To turn French into German costs no trouble;

while to turn German into good French is often altogether impossible, so little is this last of one measure with the first. The Greek and Latin classics are made to utter themselves in German, as they can do in no other tongue not their own. Not only are their thoughts translated, but the form and coloring of them also are retained with the most graphic fidelity. The celebrated Voss, in his translations of Hesiod and Homer from the Greek, and of Horace and Virgil from the Latin, carries this fidelity so far as to give his originals, verse for verse, with full transcript of measure and rhythm, from beginning to end. Whatever may be the thought of the wisdom of so slavish a method, we may well admire the resources of the language which could at all allow its use.

Being of such nature and character as we have now shown original, full, vital, deep, inward, strong and free, the language of Germany forms at the same time an entrance into the living mind of Germany—a vast, rich domain of sentiment and thought, which can never be effectually entered in any other way. Every language, we have already seen is a medium of access in this manner to a new sphere of human existence, a world of mind and life which is peculiarly and exclusively its own. To gain possession of it in the way of knowledge, is like travelling into a foreign clime or following the torch of history into a past age; only a more real communion than either with the actual spirit of men different from ourselves. Greek and Roman history can never be well understood without the help of Greek and Roman speech; and for the knowledge of the East, the most necessary of all disciplines is some demiciliation first of all in the forms and idioms of an Oriental tongue. In the same way, the German language is the only sufficient key to the German mind. To study it is to travel into Germany itself, and to become acquainted with the historical, social, moral, and political spirit of the country, beyond all that is possible by any sort of study besides. And is it saying too much to affirm, that the world here offered to our view is pre-eminently worthy of being entered and studied in this way? The mind of Germany is a system of existence, a whole order of being, answerable in all respects to the language in which it is mirrored and expressed. Like this, it is original, vigorous, large, and free; instinct with life; inward, earnest, deep; full of genial heart and soul; the very home of poetry and philosophy in their most spiritual form. France, Italy, Spain, may have softer and brighter skies; but to Germany belongs em-

phatically the empire of the spirit. Among all modern nationalities, with their different spheres of mind, there is none that better deserves to be explored by outside students, none that is more sure to reward their study with liberal and invigorating fruit.

And what shall we say of the treasures of art and learning which the wealth of the German mind has caused to be stored away in the wealth of the German tongue, and to which full access can be had only through its means. Germany is the land of books. Nowhere have the sciences been cultivated with more diligence and success. Nowhere is literature more fully and entirely at home. In all that pertains to philosophy, theology, history, German scholarship fairly leads and rules the world. Its very errors and follies serve to proclaim its kingly character and position in this respect, as being concerned with the deepest questions of the time, and belonging plainly to the central course of modern thought. No one can be regarded as in any sense abreast now with the proper culture of the age, in aesthetics, logic, or ethics, in metaphysical, theological, historical, philosophical inquiries and speculations of any kind, who has not made himself familiar, to some extent, with what has been accomplished in these different departments of knowledge by German learning. It is not necessary that he should be a blind follower of Kant or Hegel, of Schleiermacher or Daub, of Neander or Guericke or Gieseler, of Julius Müller or Richard Rothe, of Ullmann, Dörner, Ebrard, Lange, or any other distinguished name, whether living or dead; but he must be trained and disciplined in the general system of thought in which this whole generation of thinkers, with all differences among themselves, have their common settlement and home. Without this, he may have learning in a certain measure, but he will not be up with the reigning literature of his time. Nothing can be more certain than that, as the world now stands, the learning of all other countries, in the spheres of which we are speaking, needs the learning of Germany to make itself complete; and with this learning there can be no real and full communion, without the knowledge of the German language.

Translations will not answer the purpose; neither is it enough to depend on second-hand reproduction or report in any way. It is, indeed, a very significant acknowledgment of the superior worth of German literature, that it is so largely translated into English on both sides of the Atlantic; and that its fruits enter so largely as they do into the best

English scholarship under other forms. But it is only a half acquaintance at best that can ever be had through such means with any foreign world of thought. For the true scholar, translations are never satisfactory. It is a poor business to read Plato or Aristotle, Homer, Horace or Virgil, St. Chrysostom or St. Augustine, in English. It is a poor thing to read an Italian or French author in this way. But of all national literatures there is not one with which this sort of mediate intercourse is so unsatisfactory as it is with the German. Translations here are known to be, for the most part, bungling caricatures. Too often they serve only to darken what they propose to illuminate and make plain. Much of the modern German thinking is fairly untranslatable; not so much on account of the language in which it is expressed, (though this is often unmanageable enough) as by reason, rather, of the form and character of the thoughts themselves, which to be fully apprehended, require to be plucked fresh from the stems and branches of the spirit-life on which they grow. What a farce must it not ever be to go floundering through Kant's *Criticism of the Pure Reason*, Hegel's *Logic* or *Æsthetics*, or Rothe's magnificent *Ethics*, on the helpless terminology of the best possible English translation. For one who is able to understand such works at all, the idea of a translation, over against the light and order of the original, must always be felt to be little better than chaos itself. And so we may say in general: to have any proper benefit from what has been wrought out by the modern mind of Germany, in psychology, in all sorts of philosophical and moral science, in the sphere of sentiment and taste, in the doctrine of history and in history itself, under all views and forms, in the whole encyclopædia of theological science, and in commentaries on the Bible, or parts of the Bible, without and we must learn to converse with the great writers of Germany in their native and natural tongue. In this view it is more particularly that a knowledge of the German language is coming to be regarded more and more, both in England and in this country, as almost indispensable to large and thorough scholarship in any profession.

It would be easy to show, if our limits allowed, that the study of the German language is a very important help for the right understanding and use of the English language. Intimately related as the two tongues are, in their common origin and genius, continual lights and shadows are flung from each upon the other, to the mind of the attentive student.

In this view, the German has far greater claims upon our regard, than either the Italian, or the Spanish, or the French. It carries us directly back to the fountains of our own historical being, the *incunabula*, we may say, of our aboriginal life. It tends thus to give us a better knowledge, and more full possession of our proper spiritual nature. We cannot make ourselves at home in it, without being better prepared by the fact to understand the true spirit both of Anglo-Saxon thought and Anglo-Saxon speech. To study the German language, in our case, is emphatically to study the English language at the same time.

## ARTICLE V.

### REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

#### LX.

#### CHARLES ALFRED BAER.

Death is no respecter of persons. The Great Reaper gathers his victims from all ages, conditions and classes. Frequently those who have scarcely passed the first step of professional life with sanguine hope and glowing zeal, are stricken down at the very threshold of their usefulness, the message on their lips not yet delivered, the errand untold, the great work scarcely commenced. The youthful, beloved and efficient minister in the fresh vigor of life and in the full tide of his influence is arrested in his course and required to lay aside his work, as well as the veteran of three score and ten, whose whole life has been expended in his Master's service. The ways of Providence are inscrutable. It is however our duty cordially to acquiesce in the appointments of Him, who does every thing according to the counsel of his most wise and righteous will, who "numbers our days," who "changes the countenance of man and sends him away." It seemed a dark dispensation which removed the subject of our sketch in the morning of his promise, at the commencement of his work, just as he was inaugurating a career of influence and success, such as any active and devoted minister might have desired. Had he lived, there is reason to believe he would have



amply justified the confidence reposed in him, and fully sustained the expectations he excited. Although many a cherished hope is buried in his grave, and a deep and solemn interest, associated with his early death, it is cheering to the Christian to know, that the Lord called him away from his earthly toil to his heavenly rest, that his death, so premature to us, was to him the realization of all that was dearest to his heart and to his pure and sanctified aspirations.

Charles Alfred Baer, the fourth son of John and Frances Baer, was born in the city of Lancaster, May 28th, 1831. Reared under the influence of pious parents, he exhibited in early life those excellent qualities which made him, in riper years, so much of a favorite. Having received his preparatory education under the direction of Prof. F. A. Muhlenberg, at the time Principal of Franklin College, Lancaster, Pa., he entered the third term of the Freshman Class, at Yale, in 1848. He passed through the ordeal of College life without censure, and without any injury to his morals. He occupied a high rank as a scholar. His industry and zeal in the prosecution of his studies, his manliness and fidelity to duty secured for him the respect and the confidence of the Faculty. He was graduated with honor, at the Commencement in 1851. He always seemed to be of a serious turn of mind, and, during the earlier part of his Collegiate course expressed a desire to prepare for the work of the ministry. This inclination was greatly strengthened in his Senior year, occasioned by a season of special religious interest in the Institution. It was at this period in his history, that he became the subject of a saving change. He earnestly sought the Saviour and found peace in believing. "It was," he writes, "in my Senior year, that, as I trust, I first experienced a change. It was in March, 1851, that I believed I was Christ's. Since that time I have never had occasion to regret the step I took. I was surrounded by many temptations. Satan often tried to draw me aside by raising doubts in my mind, but they were cleared away, like clouds before the splendor of that light which comes from God's word." His mind had, however, for a long time previous been exercised upon the great question of eternity. He says, "I was, during my Sophomore and Junior years, much disturbed by doubts and fears. The piety of many around me naturally turned my attention to myself, and led me to inquire whether I really had hope in Christ. And among the first steps taken, was the

perusal of a work on *Self-Knowledge*, in which I was directed to prayer and the reading of God's Word for illumination. I frequently employed the former method, but I cannot say so much of the other. But I gained some knowledge of myself, and in my Senior year I felt the necessity of taking some further steps. It was during the revival in the Spring of 1851, that I was more than ordinarily concerned on the subject. By attending on those instruments of God's grace, preaching and prayer, I became more enlightened. I saw that I was trying to make a way for myself, and it was only when I was ready to cast away all my own attempts to become righteous and to see the necessity of the all-atoning sacrifice of Christ, that I had peace. Oh! I shall ever remember the evening, when I was enabled to say in faith, 'Lord, here am I, make me thine.' "

His consecration to the ministry of reconciliation was simultaneous with the consecration of himself to the service of God. "I went from College," he writes just after his graduation, "with the determination to labor in God's ministry, and it gave me some pleasure to think that my thoughts were ever brought to this, and I was strengthened with the hope, that if I were ever called to the work, I would also be sustained in whatever trials might come upon me." That he had been thoughtful with regard to the salvation of his soul for some time before he came to an unreserved decision upon the subject, may be inferred also from an entry in his journal, written in August, 1851. He alludes to a dream which he had in his Junior year, and thus describes it: "I dreamed I was walking in Atwater street towards the Library building. I had just passed from York to Atwater, when suddenly I saw over the Library building a strange appearance. The sky opened; a host of beings appeared; I was at a loss to understand it, but it soon came to my mind that it was the Last Day, and that this was the Great Judge with his attendants. Soon they appear on the earth. The Judge sends forth his attendants to gather his chosen. They pass around, but they come not to me. They look at me with an expression that said, 'You are none of His,' and I am left among the rejected. Thus passed the dream, when I awoke. I never told it, but I have often thought of it, and now record it for future reference." It is not inconsistent with God's character to suppose that he sometimes interposes his power in this way to arrest the sinner's attention and warn him of his danger. It is certain that the dream made a very deep

impression upon Mr. Baer's mind, and awakened serious resolutions. It was not, however, until the Spring of 1851, during his vacation on a visit to his parents, that he made a public profession of his faith. He was received in full communion with the Holy Trinity Church, Lancaster, then under the pastoral care of Rev. Dr. Baker.

Mr. Baer, immediately after his graduation, returned home and commenced his professional studies. The following year he entered the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, where he faithfully and successfully continued his studies until the Spring of 1855, his genial temper and Christian spirit endearing him to his fellow-students, his Professors, and all with whom he was associated. He was soon after licensed by the Synod of Pennsylvania, at its meeting in Harrisburg. During the summer, as he had no permanent charge, he preached at various points, wherever his services were required. In the autumn of 1855 he received and accepted a call to the Passayunk Church, Philadelphia, where he labored for nearly four years with efficiency and great acceptance to the congregation. During part of this period he was engaged several hours every week in giving instruction in the Academy, under the care of T. D. James, Esq. This he regarded as only a temporary arrangement, as he felt that he was called to the great work of preaching the Gospel. In 1859, at the repeated and earnest solicitation of the Lutheran Church at Norristown, he consented to become their Pastor, and here, until his death, he devoted himself with all his energies to the cause of his Divine Master. His labors were most successful. The congregation and the Sabbath School increased so rapidly, that a new church edifice, adapted to their wants, became necessary. To the advancement of this enterprise he devoted himself with great assiduity, in awakening an interest among his people and securing contributions for the object; he kindly headed the list with a subscription of one thousand dollars. He had the satisfaction of witnessing the laying of the corner-stone, in connexion with which he officiated only a few weeks before his death, and was anticipating with pleasure the completion of the building, when in his own church he could again preach the unsearchable riches of Christ. But Providence ordered otherwise. Scarcely were the walls of the edifice half-way reared, when the devoted Pastor was cut down in the full bloom of health, in the midst of his usefulness, surrounded

by the fruitions of faithful labor, and with the happiest prospects of the future. He died in the 34th year of his age, September 9th, 1863, after a brief illness, contracted, it is supposed, during a visit to the Battle-Field at Gettysburg, where he was in attendance as a Director of the Theological Seminary, at the annual meeting of its Board in August. We met him then in our study, and soon afterwards in his own parish, cheerful and happy, with the same bright face, winning cordial manner, with which he was wont to greet his friends. Little did we, at the time, suppose that he was so near his journey's end, and we should no more meet him again in this world. The ways of God often seem to us dark and mysterious, but we know that he is too wise to err, and too good to be unkind. In his designs,

"God is his own interpreter,  
And he will make it plain."

Mr. Baer had been indisposed for some time, but no serious consequences were apprehended. A change in the disease, however, developed unfavorable symptoms, and left no hope of his recovery. When informed by his physician, about an hour before his departure, of his condition, he received the announcement with great composure and resignation. He had no fear of death. He had for his consolation and support Him who

"Above all others,  
Well deserves the name of friend."

His mind was clear and collected. Extending his hand to his friends who had gathered around his couch, he bade them an affectionate farewell, and in a clear, loud voice, which surprised every one, supplicated the throne of grace for his congregation, his Sabbath School, his mother and brothers, and the family of Judge Jacoby, in which he lived, with an earnestness and eloquence that melted all hearts. Then audibly repeating the promises of God to believers, he joyfully called upon his Lord and Saviour to come quickly, and gently fell asleep in Jesus. The faithful Redeemer graciously fulfilled his promise. He did not leave or forsake him. So peacefully and triumphantly did he pass away, that it seemed as if the Holy Ghost were specially manifested to show the value of saving faith, its supporting and sanctifying power, in the death of a dying Christian, in his last conflict with the enemy.



His funeral was attended by a long train of mourners, his broken-hearted congregation, his clerical brethren, and a large circle of devoted, bereaved friends. The services were held in the Presbyterian Church, which was crowded in every part, and participated in by Rev. Messrs. C. W. Schaeffer, D. D., G. F. Krotel, C. P. Krauth, D. D., E. W. Hutter, F. A. M. Keller, L. E. Albert, J. W. Hassler, G. F. Miller, H. Wendt, of our own church, J. F. Halsey, D. D., and R. Adair, D. D., of the Presbyterian, and P. S. Davis, of the German Reformed Church, all ecclesiastical differences being forgotten in the general grief which pervaded the community. The mortal remains were thence taken to Lancaster, and, on the following day, among kindred, committed to their long repose in the beautiful cemetery of Woodward Hill, there beneath its shades, guarded by an unseen presence, to await the resurrection morn, till

“The last trumpet’s joyful sound!”

Seldom has it been our duty to speak of one whose virtues were so many, whose character was so pure and so symmetrical, whose devotion to his work was so deep and earnest and who leaves a memory so precious and fragrant, as the subject of our present narrative. He was one of our most useful and tenderly-beloved young ministers, and lived long enough to furnish the Church abundant evidence of his usefulness and piety. Beautiful in his faith and in the integrity of his life, his record is deeply impressed on our hearts, whilst a more faithful and a far more complete one is written on high. His character seemed under God the result of his early training, of influences the most pure and elevated, the ever ripening fruit of seed sown in his childhood. From the atmosphere which pervaded the home of his youth he inhaled the spirit, which marked his Christian course and animated his dying-hour.

His character for piety was above suspicion, genuine and unselfish, unobtrusive, constant and regular in its exercise, a settled, steady uniform principle, carried into all the details of duty and affecting his whole temper and conversation. He was distinguished for his purity, conscientiousness, love of truth, sincerity, adherence to his convictions of duty and moral courage. His personal qualities were of a high order. There was nothing cynical or severe in his disposition. His heart was full of warm, tender, generous affection. His kindness beamed from his countenance, spoke in his voice



and was expressed in his whole manner. No man was ever more free from ill-will, harshness and evil-speaking, the aimless jest and the idle word, and so abounding in things true and just and lovely and of good report. He had no faults so prominent as to cast a shade upon the brightness of his character. A life so correct and controlled by so cheerful and benevolent a spirit, could not fail to secure for him the unbounded confidence of his ministerial brethren, and sincere affection wherever he was known.

As a preacher, Mr. Baer was solid, instructive and evangelical. Exemplifying in his own life the power and blessedness of the Gospel, he produced the conviction that he preached not himself, but was filled with zeal for the Redeemer's glory and a love for the souls of men. His matter was elevated and adapted to fill the mind with noble thoughts and the heart with devout feelings, his manner was solemn, earnest and affectionate. He never by tone, language or gesture, expressed an emotion, which he did not feel. He loved and cherished and always firmly vindicated the doctrines of the Cross. His pulpit labors were very acceptable.

As a Pastor he was most faithful and conscientious, diligent and active in every good work, a willing laborer in his Master's vineyard, and was highly appreciated and esteemed by his congregation. Very many who had been careless and godless, during his ministry became regular attendants upon the services of the sanctuary. He took a deep interest in his Sabbath-school and his efforts were not without their appropriate and promised results. He would go from house to house, in the alleys and outskirts of the town, pressing the claims of religion, and gathering the young into the school. The congregation rejoices in the success of his well-planned labors, the poor mourn their best friend gone, and even the little children remember him with pleasure and regret. He did not labor in vain. His work will continue to abide.

The youthful, faithful and beloved Pastor has gone. God has taken him to himself. While we are struggling with sin, encountering sorrow, and pursuing our toilsome way in this world, he has entered upon his rest. He holds communion with holy and happy beings and, above all, with his adorable Creator and Saviour. May we be prepared to follow him and in due time, hear his Lord and Master call us, too, to receive the reward of faithful servants!

## FROM THE REV. F. A. MUHLENBERG,

PROFESSOR IN PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE.

GETTYSBURG, JUNE 23, 1864.

My dear Professor: At your request, I have put down on paper, a few thoughts upon our deceased friend Charles Alfred Baer. It has been both pleasant and sad to do so; *pleasant*, for it recalls to my mind the agreeable intercourse I had with him some years ago; *sad*, for it reminds me of his early and lamented death, and the loss which the Church has sustained by his removal from us.

You desire a few particulars of his early life, as *scholia* upon your own Article in the Review. You are aware, that I had a favorable opportunity of becoming acquainted with him, for I saw him daily for some years, whilst he was prosecuting his classical and mathematical studies, in the Institution at Lancaster, with which I was connected. This enables me to speak of him with some degree of confidence, and apart from this, his character was so guileless and transparent, that it soon became known to any one, and could easily be described. There was nothing to be concealed in his case, there was little else to do than to commend.

I remember well the seat he occupied so long; and he was always to be found there, unless occasional sickness prevented, was always employed, and always *well* employed. I do not now recollect, that he ever failed in the discharge of any of his duties, and I know that he never gave me any occasion to censure him. My own recollection of him is, that he was uniformly obedient, uniformly docile and attentive. If I were to particularize his distinguishing features at that time, as they appeared to me, I would say, they were unvarying fidelity, unaffected modesty, and attractive sweetness of disposition. I never witnessed any exhibition of ill-humor. It ever afforded me the greatest pleasure to hear his recitations, and to witness the steady progress he was making from year to year, in those studies, which, without his own knowledge, were helping to prepare him for great usefulness in the Church in after years.

After "Alfred," as we used to call him, left us, to go to Yale College, I heard of his continued success there also, as well as continued good conduct, and the strong hold he had upon the affections of his fellow students. He was elected Associate Editor of their Magazine, and subsequently graduated with honor.

During the time, that he was a student in the Theological Seminary at this place, preparing for the work of the ministry in the Lutheran Church, to which his parents, brothers, and many of his friends belonged, he frequently stopped at our house, and whilst it afforded us pleasure to see him, our children, especially one now with him in the better land, were always still more glad to welcome his approach, and enter into familiar conversation with him; and I know nothing better calculated to show the kindness of his heart, and the attractiveness of his appearance and demeanor, than the affection with which the little ones regarded him.

After his entrance upon the duties of the ministry, and his connection with the Synod of Pennsylvania, I met him there at each successive meeting, and always engaged in efforts to do good. When we met in Philadelphia, I passed him on the streets, during the intervals of our sessions, distributing religious papers; and the last year, I listened with

much satisfaction to a discourse he delivered at Reading, in Trinity Church, during the Synodical session, upon the subject of Education. On this same occasion also, we met in company, for the last time, at the house of a friend. His pleasant conversation and cheerful laugh seem to be still sounding in my ears, and I cannot forget the happy effect his presence seemed to produce upon all assembled, both young and old. All appeared to be drawn towards him, and this always seemed to be the case, for though the world is full of envy and detraction, I cannot say, that I have heard any one speak of him with unkindness; on the contrary, many of all classes, educated and uneducated, joining in his praise.

How it pained me to hear of his death! Animated by a love of country and Christian principle, he visited this place, after the great battles of last July, and laid the seeds of that disease, which carried him off so suddenly, when his powers were blossoming into full maturity, with the brightest prospect of future usefulness and distinction, and, as we think, too soon for the interests of the Lutheran Church in general, and that one at Norristown, of which he was the Pastor, and I had almost said, the *idol*. In the case of one so faithful, so lovely, with such promise of usefulness, who is not disposed to say,:

*Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus  
Tam cari capitis?*

Yet whilst we regret, and deeply regret his early removal, we doubt not, he has gone "to fairer worlds on high," and has a bliss, in the bosom of his Saviour and his God, which far transcends in value, what he has lost below. *We* have lost, but *he* has gained. Would that many more such young men might be induced to give themselves up to Christ and the Church of their fathers, after the example of our beloved youthful friend! Our Lutheran Zion would soon arise from the dust, and the days of her mourning be ended.

Yours truly,

F. A. MUHLENBERG.

FROM C. W. SCHAEFFER, D. D., GERMANTOWN, PA.

GERMANTOWN, JUNE 1, 1864.

My Dear Sir: No biographical sketch of the late Rev. C. A. Baer could fail to be interesting. His many excellent traits, his intellectual cultivation, his refined manners, his cheerful equanimity, his professional ability and zeal, were all so many points that might well serve to make the record of him attractive, even to those who did not enjoy his personal acquaintance.

I am satisfied, that he ever grew in the esteem of those who had the privilege of occasional intercourse with him, and that the universal lamentation with which his Church and Sunday-school bewailed his death, was the unrestrained tribute of Christian affection to his high personal worth.

His personal appearance, combined as it was with a rare cheerfulness of spirit and a graceful courteousness of manner, was apt, at once, to attract attention and to secure confidence. His education had been conducted under all the advantages the land could afford. He profited by them, and in addition to his pastoral labors was able so to conduct the

education of others as to prepare them for entering the advanced classes of some of our most distinguished Colleges.

His zealous and consistent devotion to the interests of the Church was known and appreciated. As a member and officer of the Board of Publication, he was prompt and cordial in the discharge of every duty incumbent upon him. As a Director of the Seminary, representing the Synod of Pennsylvania, he was deeply interested in the cause of theological education. But to his own congregation, as was proper, he seemed to have devoted his purest affections. It was truly remarkable, and very interesting, how, on all suitable occasions, during his intercourse with others, he would be sure to introduce his darling topic, the interests and welfare of the flock the Lord had given him in charge.

His labors, I think, were appreciated. His Church and Sunday School were largely attended, and on the day of his funeral, it was literally true, that the "mourners went about the streets."

I saw on that occasion aged fathers and mothers weeping as though they had lost a son, and little children sobbing as though their hearts were broken. As I saw it I was reminded of the familiar words, which, I believe, may be most truthfully applied to him :

"None knew him, but to love him,  
None named him, but to praise !"

As ever, I am sincerely yours,  
C. W. SCHAEFFER.

FROM HON. D. M. SMYSER, NORRISTOWN, PA.

NORRISTOWN, JULY 25th, 1864.

My dear Professor : It affords me a melancholy pleasure to respond to your note of the 20th, inst., in regard to our mutual friend, the late Rev. Charles A. Baer.

I enjoyed the privilege of his acquaintance from the time he came here to take charge of the Lutheran congregation in this place, to the period of his death, and can say, from the first moment of his residence among us, he enjoyed, in an unusual degree, the respect, attachment, and confidence of this entire community. By the people of his charge, he was, in an especial manner, beloved and appreciated. To them his labors were of inestimable value, and had been already crowned with an unusual measure of success, when his lamented death occurred. Among them, the prevalent feeling was, I feel warranted in saying, one of fraternal regard, intensified by Christian communion and fellowship into warm personal affection : and his early death shrouded in sorrow the hearts of his entire congregation. But the feeling of grief was not confined to his own people. It is no exaggeration to say, that this whole community felt a sense of painful bereavement in his death.

. Whilst modest and unassuming in his deportment, he possessed learning and talent to qualify him to take a prominent position in any society. If I were to specify any one quality for which he was particularly distinguished, it would be that of *earnestness* in the pursuit of aims that his heart and judgment approved. In their pursuit he was untiring. No selfish feeling ever diverted him from his course. There was an absolute denial of self. Indeed, his earnestness was only equalled by his self-abnegation. There was, withal, a *manliness* about him,

which his quiet, modest demeanor did not prepare strangers to expect. This was illustrated in his disregard of personal consequences when obeying what he regarded as the call of duty. Of this your citizens and you had an opportunity of judging, on his visit to Gettysburg shortly after the great battle fought there last year, when almost every house was a hospital and your vicinage one vast charnel-house. You then witnessed his untiring, self-sacrificing devotion to the mangled and suffering victims of the most monstrous treason that the world ever saw. Neither physical exhaustion operating on a frame somewhat delicate and unused to labor, nor the fear of contagion and disease, caused any intermission of his labors day and night among the sick, the suffering, and the dying; and it is too much to be feared that to them his premature death is, in part, owing.

He was also a *liberal* man; liberal of his means, as shown by his large contribution to the erection of the new and splendid Church his late congregation are now engaged in erecting, and which owes its undertaking to his influence and exertions; but liberal, in the larger and more comprehensive sense of Christian charity and toleration. Whilst earnestly holding the opinions and doctrines of his particular denomination, he was no bigot; but in all my intercourse with him, I ever found him ready to acknowledge the right of private judgment, however variant the paths into which conscientious men were led by it. This always struck me as one of the most beautiful traits in his character, and which many would do well to emulate. He was, to crown all, a *loyal friend of the Union*—as true to his country—his whole country—as he was to his religion.

But it has pleased the All-wise Disposer to withdraw him from the field of labor and trial: and all that remains for his surviving friends, is to cherish his memory, follow his example, and hold it up for the emulation of others.

Very respectfully, and truly yours,

DANIEL M. SMYSER.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

PRECIOUS STONES. TRANSLATED FROM ZELLER'S BIBLISCHES WÖRTERBUCH.

By Prof. CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER, D. D., Philadelphia.

This appellation is given to certain stones distinguished by their peculiar hardness, lustre, transparency, or beautiful colors. Modern science has adopted a certain classification, not known to the ancients, according to which precious stones, properly so called, are distinguished from others to which the term is applied only in a qualified sense. The former are capable of cutting into flint, in consequence of



their superior hardness, and are transparent : the latter do not possess these properties, although their lustre and colors are very agreeable to the eye. Precious stones were collected by David, for the purpose of ornamenting the temple (1 Chron. 29 : 2), were presented to Solomon by the Queen of Arabia (1 Kings 10 : 2), were brought to him from Ophir in Hiram's ships (v. 11), and constituted a part of the treasures of which Hezekiah was vain (2 Chron. 32 : 27). They were royal ornaments, being set in the crown of the king of the Ammonites, which David placed on his own head (2 Sam. 12 : 30), of the king of Tyre (Ezek. 28 : 13), and are mentioned in Song of Sol. 5 : 14. They were inserted in the high-priest's ephod, and were inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes (Exod. 28 : 6—12). The breast-plate of Aaron, the high-priest, claims special attention. It contained twelve precious stones, on each of which was engraved the name of one of the twelve tribes, (Exod. 28 : 15, etc.) The twelve precious stones described in Rev. 21 : 19, etc., as the foundations of the new Jerusalem, doubtless corresponded to these, and contained the names of the twelve Apostles (v. 14). Our present sources of information do not enable us to furnish, with entire certainty in every case, modern names of objects, precisely equivalent to the Hebrew and Greek names. It is, however, certain that the twelve precious stones mentioned in the Bible, and unquestionably the most valuable and beautiful of all known to the ancients, correspond in general, with the names in our modern version, and these are recognized by science as pre-eminent in value. They cannot all be satisfactorily identified, and the correspondence between the ancient and modern names is, therefore, in some instances, doubtful.

We adopt in our enumeration the order of arrangement observed in the high-priest's breast-plate. A different order is followed (for reasons not known) and other names, to a certain extent, occur in the account of the precious stones forming the foundations of the new Jerusalem (Rev. c. 21.) The arrangement of the names of the tribes varies also in the latter passage, (which appears to be a repetition of Ezek. 48 : 31, etc.,) from the order chosen in the breast-plate. To which names in the breast-plate those of the Apostles respectively correspond, cannot be satisfactorily ascertained.

1. The *Sardius*, with Reuben's name (the sixth in Rev. 21 : 20). The Hebrew word indicates a red or reddish stone ;

it is supposed by some to be the Cornelian, which is much admired and valued, and the finest specimens of which are brought from Arabia, (see Ezek. 28: 13). In Rev. 4: 3, John introduces the jasper (the diamond in this instance), and the sardine stone, the ruddy lustre of which is remarkable, as images of the glory of God.

2. The *Topaz*, with Simeon's name, (the ninth in Rev.) The Hebrew word very probably designates, not the gem now known as the topaz, but rather the modern chrysolite. The latter is a transparent stone, of a beautiful bright or lustrous green color; it is often found in Egypt and Nubia, which borders on it. According to Job 28: 19, where unquestionably the most precious object on earth was chosen as an image of divine wisdom, it evidently was a gem of the highest value, as it still is in modern times.

3. The *Emerald*, with Levi's name (the fourth in Rev.) The Hebrew word signifies to *lighten, glitter*. The stone is of an uncommonly beautiful grass-green or pistachio green color, possesses the property of double refraction, is very rare and valuable, and was formerly found only in Upper Egypt, but at present in South America also. The green color of this stone, which is exceedingly soft and pleasant to the eye, adorned the rainbow seen by John about the throne of God—a beautiful symbol of divine mercy and grace.

4. The *Ruby*, with Judah's name (supposed to be the same as the Chalcedony, the fourth in Rev.) Its dark red color gives it the appearance of burning charcoal, whence its other name *Carbuncle* is derived. It is, next to the diamond, the most costly of all the precious stones, as specimens weighing ten carats have been sold for more than \$700. It was among the precious stones collected by David as ornaments of the temple (1 Chron. 29: 2,) and is also introduced as an image of the gifts which the Lord promises to bestow on his people in place of their former shame and distress (Is. 54: 12.)

5. The *Sapphire*, with Dan's name (the second in Rev.) The Hebrew word is of the same sound. This stone is of a fine sky-blue color, possesses a rich lustre, and ranks next to the diamond and ruby in hardness. It is mentioned in connection with other gems in Job 28: 16 and Is. 54: 11, and appears to have been highly appreciated already in very ancient times.

6. The *Diamond*, with Naphtali's name. It is probable that the Hebrew word should have been translated Onyx,

(Sardonyx, the fifth in Rev.—see No. 12 below.) The Onyx is of a whitish color, with a reddish yellow or nearly orange shade, resembling that of the lunated spot at the base of the human nail which the Greek word (Onyx) signifies. This gem was much esteemed by the ancients.

7. The *Ligure*, with Gad's name, probably the Hyacinth, or Jacinth, (Rev. 21: 20.) The latter is a very hard and valuable stone, of a red color tinged with brown, and also exhibiting yellow and green shades. The Ligure is supposed by others to be the modern Opal, which is not a hard stone, but of a beautiful milk white color; it was much valued by the ancients on account of its iridescence (red, green and yellow,) and is very costly in modern times.

8. The *Agate*, with Asher's name, supposed by some to be the Chrysoprasus, (the tenth in Rev.) The Agate of the moderns is an aggregate of various minerals, amethyst, jasper, rock-crystal, chalcedony, etc. It is variegated in the most beautiful manner with dots, zones, etc., which resemble walls, streams, clouds and other objects, on which account it has always been highly esteemed. The Chrysoprase, on the contrary, is of a pale green color somewhat resembling that of the emerald; this hue does not occur in the agate. There is, accordingly, reason to believe that the agate of Exod. 28 and the chrysoprase of Rev. 21 are not the same. Modern chemistry can, it is true, demonstrate the resemblance between their component parts, but this chemical affinity was not known to the ancients.

9. The *Amethyst*, with Issachar's name (the twelfth in Rev.) It is a transparent gem of a violet or deep red color, and is, properly, merely quartz or rock crystal of superior value, and of a blue hue. It was highly esteemed by the ancients, who supposed that it caused dreams, (hence its Hebrew name,) and that wine drunk out of an amethystine cup, would not intoxicate (hence its Greek name).

10. The *Turquoise*, with Zebulun's name. The Hebrew name, which is somewhat similar in sound, suggests the city of Tartessus (Tarshish) in Spain, where it is still found, and whence the Phoenicians may have obtained it. It is supposed to be the Chrysolite of the ancients (the seventh in Rev.) and the Topaz of the moderns. It is a valuable transparent stone, of a yellow or reddish color. The turquoise of the moderns is a gem of an azure color.

11. The *Onix*, with Joseph's name, but, probably, here the *Beryl*, the eighth in Rev. It is a green or bluish stone.

allied to the emerald. It ornamented the ephod of the high-priest (Exod. 28 : 9.) and is mentioned among the treasures of the land of Havilah (Gen. 2 : 12.)

12. The *Jasper*, with Benjamin's name, unquestionably not the same as the jasper of the moderns, although the Hebrew name is of a similar sound. For according to Rev. 21 : 11, it is a perfectly transparent stone of a brilliant lustre, insomuch that John compares to it (4 : 3) the glorified body of the Son of Man—a comparison for which the jasper, an inferior gem, would answer less than any other, as it does not possess those properties. It is entirely opaque, does not acquire a lustre until it is polished, is of a red, brown or green color, often marked with belts or stripes, and is neither rare nor costly. The passages in Revelation, referred to above, unquestionably indicate the Diamond, the most valuable of all the precious stones, which combines the transparency of the purest water with the brightness of a flame of fire, and which is so hard that the best files produced in England can make no impression on it. Its commercial value is always very great. John could not have chosen a more appropriate object, when he instituted the above comparison, than the diamond. It was obtained from the East Indies by the ancients. It was doubtless polished by them, as it still is by the moderns occasionally, with the aid of Corundum or Emery, a variety of Corundum, a mineral nearly as hard as the diamond itself. The Hebrew word *Samir* is translated *diamond* in Jer. 17 : 1, where the sin of Judah is said to be written with a Shamir-pencil. The latter is also an image of Ezekiel's firmness in the presence of the obstinate house of Israel (3 : 9,) as well as of Judah's hardness of heart, (Zech. 7 : 12—in both cases translated *adamant*.)

In addition to these precious stones, others are mentioned in the Scriptures, which cannot now be fully identified (Ezek. 27 : 16 coral and agate; Is. 54 : 12 agate, a different word in the original from the name of the stone in the high-priest's breast-plate; Job 28 : 17, 18 crystal and coral, &c.)

The precious stones are also introduced figuratively. In Prov. 17 : 8, the gifts which a man bestows, and by which he acquires honor, are compared to them. The apostle compares, in 1 Cor. 3 : 12, the Church of Christ and the spiritual life of the individual Christian, to a structure composed of gold, silver and precious stones. But when the latter deck the woman described in Rev. 17 : 1, they furnish an image of the temptations of worldly glory, and of the helplessness of that glory when a fall occurs (16 : 12, 16.)



## ARTICLE VII.

THE LORD'S SUPPER — TRANSLATED FROM ZELLER'S  
BIBLISCHES WÖRTERBUCH.

By Prof. F. A. MUHLBERG, A. M., of Pennsylvania College.

1. The Greek word *δειπνον* signifies the ordinary principal meal, which the Hebrews, as well as the ancients generally, were accustomed to take towards evening. Mark 6: 21; Luke 14: 12; John 13: 2. As there is often mention made in the Old Testament of a rich feast, of the eating and drinking of the servants of God, Is. 25: 6; 65: 13; Cant. 2: 4, so also Jesus makes use of this figure, to represent clearly the gracious blessings which are to be enjoyed, through sanctified communion with him, already in this world, but still more in heaven, Luke 14: 16. This Supper is called *great*, on account of the greatness and dignity of the host, the exalted and pleasing character of the enjoyments, the magnitude of the honor, the excellence and multitude of the guests. The most precious dainty is the favor of God and the love of Jesus Christ. As the exalted Son of the King intends to unite himself most intimately with, and to be married to his people, he invites them from time to time to a *wedding entertainment*. Matt. 12: 2. This has an early meal preceeding it *αριστον*, which extends throughout a long period, until the hour of the actual wedding has arrived, Rev. 19: 7. After the fall of anti-Christ, the bride of Christ appears in her beautiful attire; her actual entrance to her bridegroom's abode succeeds immediately after the last contest and victory, Matt. 25: 10; Rev. 21: 2. On that great morning of the world's regeneration; when Satan has been bound, Christ will hold, with the victors of all ages, his glorious triumphal entertainment, the Supper of the Lamb, Rev. 19: 9, when the Lord, revealed in all his tender sympathy to his faithful servants, manifests to each one in succession a peculiar favor, as it is promised in Luke 12: 37, *cf.* Cant. 5: 1. We must not interpret this in a sensual nor too spiritual a manner for, "The union of the material and the spiritual is in accordance with the ways and works of God."



An awful contrast to this Holy Supper is presented in that one to which the angel in the sun is to invite "the fowls in the midst of Heaven," Rev. 19: 17.

2. The second sacrament of the New Testament was thus named *Abendmahl* in the Lutheran Church, from 1 Cor. 11: 20: because the first preparations for its celebration were made in the evening. In the Reformed Church it is very generally called *Nachtmal*. Other designations are: Table of the Lord 1 Cor. 10: 21, cf. Ps. 23: 5. Communion of the body and blood of Christ, breaking of bread, Luke 24: 35; Acts 2: 42. Cup of blessing, of praise and thanksgiving (Eucharist,) sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, feast of love, because originally such a meal either preceded or followed it. Mass in the Roman Church, because formerly they were accustomed to call out to the catechumens: *Ite, missa est ecclesia* (retire, the congregation is dismissed.)

As holy baptism is the gate, by which we enter into the gracious Kingdom of Jesus Christ, into living communion with Him, so the Holy Supper is the blessed table, where all the spiritual soldiers of Christ, as often as they withdraw, exhausted from the conflicts with their foes, receive new strength and fresh power to overcome, (as Abraham, Gen. 15: 17, 18, was refreshed by Melchizedek with bread and wine,) and are encouraged to steadfastness in fellowship with Jesus. It is, to make use of the expression of ancient writers, the concentrated gospel, the soul, the glory of it, the chief good in this valley of tears, as the Moravians describe it.

Resting upon the declarations of Jesus in the New Testament, (Matt. 26: 26—28; Mark 14: 22—24; Luke 22: 19, 20; 1 Cor. 11: 13—25,) which he uttered in the presence of his disciples, the evening before his sufferings and death, at the celebration of the *Passover*, Matt. 26: 17—19, the *Lutheran Church* teaches, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are *truly* present in the Lord's Supper, and given and received with the external substances, bread and wine. Apology for Augs. Conf. Art. 18. In the Larger Catechism, Luther thus answers the question, "What is the sacrament of the altar? It is the true body and blood of Christ in and under the bread and wine, given to Christians, by the command of Christ, to eat and drink. You can satisfy your scruples by the word of God and say: If a hundred thousand devils, together with all fanatics, suggest the question, How can bread and wine be the body and blood of Christ? still I know, that all spirits and learned

men combined into one mass have not as much wisdom as the Divine Majesty in his little finger. For as Christ speaks so it is, for he cannot lie or deceive." The manner of receiving the body and blood of Christ is supernatural and beyond the comprehension of human reason. The external symbols and the body and blood of Christ are united, in a sacramental i. e., mysterious way, intimately with one another, as long as the celebration of the Supper continues, therefore the cup, 1 Cor. 10: 16, is called a communion of the blood, the bread, a communion of the body, not the body itself, (as it must be according to the Catholic view.) From the expression, being guilty of the body and blood of Christ 1 Cor. 11: 27, sq., it is inferred that even the unworthy truly receive the body and blood of Christ, not however for life and consolation, but for judgment and damnation, if they do not repent and be converted, (Form. Concord. 1: 7.)

The nearest to the Lutheran doctrine in truth and thoroughness is *Calvin*, in reference to whom Luther is said to have expressed himself, the very year before his death, as follows: "He is certainly a learned and pious man; I would have ventured in the commencement, to have submitted the whole matter of this contest to his decision." P. Henry II, 503. "Under the sacred pledges of bread and wine," says Calvin, "the body of Christ is substantially given us to eat and drink." He recognizes in the Holy Supper a mysterious, highly efficient means of grace, believes that the Son of God is truly present therein and unites himself with us as our Mediator. His view, however, has something in it, obscure and vacillating. Setting out with the conviction, that Christ is in heaven, and cannot therefore, be directly present with us, he expresses himself at one time, as though, the believer, in the moment of his participation, was raised up to Christ and received from his hands, graciously extended, heavenly blessings, or the living Christ elevates the soul to himself in heaven, where it joyfully partakes of his body and blood; and again otherwise, as though in the moment of believing reception, a supernatural power streams forth from the glorified substance of Christ, as the sun animates all creatures by its rays, whereby the soul of the believer is nourished and strengthened in a miraculous manner. Calvin's own words are: "Christ dwelling within us, so unites us thereby to himself, that he pours forth into us the living power of his body, in the same way in which we are animated by the warm rays of the sun. Christ, who remains in heav-

en, descends to us, with the power of his glorified body." Yet he always returns to this point, when he desires to determine anything about it, as though he were sensible that language as well as thought were insufficient for his purpose. It follows from this of itself, that the unworthy communicant only receives the external signs. *Zwingli* and *Ecclampadius*, in opposing the Catholic doctrine, fell into the superficial view, and one altogether unsatisfactory to Christian consciousness, that there is nothing mysterious in the Holy Supper, that it is only a *sign* and ordinance by which we acknowledge our connection with the Christian Church, make known our profession of faith, and, by means of which we call to mind the death of Jesus with the benefits of his atonement, and confide in the mercy of God in Christ. Our faith is thus animated and strengthened. According to this view, we would receive no more in the Sacrament, than could be received without it, in direct opposition to the clear statements of Scripture, as John 6: 53: 1 Cor. 10: 16; 11: 27; and the words of Jesus: *This is*, would merely mean, *This signifies*.

The *Catholic Church* agrees with the Lutheran in the literal interpretation of the words of its institution, and in the belief of a supernatural, substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ, and this was in general the doctrine of the Church-fathers of the first centuries; but she unites with it the additional, unscriptural representation, which originated since the ninth century, of a change (Transubstantiation,) and then of a repeated or continued sacrifice. The question How are the heavenly and earthly elements united? was thus answered: Bread and wine are changed by the consecration of the priest, so that after this, there is only one thing, namely body and blood. What has become of the earthly elements? They answer in a scholastic manner: their accidents, their color, form, taste are indeed still there, but their substance is changed. Upon this is based this further inference, as the host consecrated by the priest is and remains the body of the Lord, it must, when it is kept, be worshipped and adored on bended knee. Therefore at the festival of Corpus Christi, it is carried about in procession and elevated for adoration. The withholding of the cup from the laity, in direct opposition to the institution of Christ, originates partly from the fear of spilling any of the contents of the consecrated cup, partly from the endeavor thereby to express and establish the distinction between the

priests and laity. A still greater error is found in the Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass. As the earliest fathers called the Lord's Supper, in a certain sense, a sacrifice, (Mal. 1 : 10, 11.) the doctrine was framed that the Mass is a real atoning sacrifice for the living and the dead, that it is Christ, who offers up himself, or is offered up to the father in a bloodless manner, that it is a perpetual humiliation, which he imposes upon himself, for the purpose of continuing his mediatorial agency. But the words of Christ : *It is finished* and the forcible passages in the epistle to the Hebrews upon the *one* offering of Christ, which is efficacious forever, Heb. 7 : 27 ; 9 : 12, 28, overthrow these representations, and every thing growing out of them, which detract so much from the merits of Christ and ascribe to the priest a more than divine power.

3. The Lutheran doctrine is indeed above reason, but not contrary to it. It is only necessary to form an accurate idea of a *glorified* body, to comprehend that there is a more real personal communication of the Saviour possible, than that which is connected with faith in him, and to which there is particular reference in Rev. 3 : 20. Cf. John 14 : 23, Eph. 3 : 17, 1 Cor. 6 : 15, Gal. 2 : 20, 2 Cor. 3 : 18. The expression, 1 Cor. 15 : 46, "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural ; and afterward that which is spiritual," may be applied also to the human nature of Christ. If we suppose, in accordance with the hints of Oetinger and Ph. M. Hahn, the existence, in the earthly body of Christ, like to our own sinful body, of a germ of a more exalted body, which becomes continually more glorified and spiritualized, just as the Scriptures speak of an inner man, Eph. 3 : 16, this glorification would necessarily pass through different stages and changes, from his baptism to his ascension into heaven. Therefore he says, when contemplating his death upon the cross : "Now is the son of man glorified and God is glorified in him," John 13 : 31. In these words he signified the manifestation of God in his human nature in general, and also in its bodily aspect. Then follows the renewed petition : "And now glorify thou me Father, with thyself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," John 17 : 5. If it was necessary that the glory of the living God should constantly be united more fully and abundantly with the human nature of Jesus, in order to pervade it entirely, the lower, grosser, resisting elements of his material



nature would necessarily be more and more overcome, destroyed and transformed, and in the same degree the resplendent body therein concealed progressively appear. The elements in him belonging to his body and soul, were exalted into the spiritual, the God-man Jesus became thus a life-giving spirit, as the apostle Paul says: "The Lord is that spirit," 2 Cor. 3: 17. It is only in this aspect of the subject, that the difficult passages, John 7: 37, 20: 22, 6: 63, Eph. 5: 30-32, become perfectly intelligible. With the progressively increasing glorification of Jesus, the abundance of the powers of his spiritual body, was likewise more and more set free, so that it could now flow without any obstruction, into the vessels standing in readiness for him, in proportion to their capacity for receiving. We may think, in this connection, of many mysterious occurrences in the natural world, e. g. how light passes through crystal without obstruction, or how heat and electricity pass through and pervade bodies. It may likewise be recollected how the mother, by means of her milk, nourishes the child also with her own flesh and blood. "In a similar manner the everlasting love of the Redeemer, which is stronger than that of a mother (Is. 49: 15,) nourishes believers in him, as babes newly born of water and the spirit, 1 Pet. 2: 2; John 3: 5, with his own flesh and blood, so that they may grow up to the stature of perfect men in Christ," Eph. 4: 13, (Kurtz.)

4. The chief design and benefit of the Holy Supper is, therefore, the communication of the glorified body and blood of Christ, the strengthening and confirmation of spiritual life, experience of salvation by a living active presence of the entire glorified Christ, who offered himself up for our benefit and in our stead, as is clearly evident from the words of its institution and 1 Cor. 11: 10. Hence follow of themselves, the other important aspects under which it is to be considered and experienced. It is indeed not only a memorial feast, but also one of propitiation, which truly appears from its connection with the passover, and the words of its institution given *for you*; besides a feast of love, of sanctification and resurrection. The last particular, resting upon John 6: 54, 55, is generally not enough attended to; the early church fathers rightly regarded the Holy Supper as the medicine of immortality; see v. Kapff, Comm. Book.

5. The words, "He gave it to his *disciples*," point to the much known fact, that the Holy Supper is designed only for the people of God, not for unconverted men or enemies of



Jesus. It is true, according to Luke 22: 21, even Judas was present at the institution of the Holy Supper: but his hypocrisy was not at that time completely disclosed, and when the last effort of love had failed, Jesus himself removed him from his society, John 13: 26. Those come to it unworthily 1 Cor. 11: 29, i. e., in a manner entirely unsuited to its nature, and therefore are undeserving of, and not qualified to receive the blessings of heavenly grace, who do not desire to become true disciples of Jesus Christ, who do not love and honor him, who have no earnest longing for him, who are not zealous in seeking the salvation of their souls. Do not then forget the great majesty of the Lord Jesus, who is willing to communicate himself to you, in the most intimate manner. Do not approach with a careless, impenitent, thoughtless and wicked heart, but in true penitence, earnest longing, living faith, and with the resolution of new obedience; at the very least, with anxious concern that you are still destitute of these feelings. The unworthy participation brings a judgment with it, 1 Cor. 11: 29, for in Corinth the sickness and death of many were its consequence, which is to be understood indeed both in a corporeal and spiritual sense.

## ARTICLE VIII.

### CATECHISATION.

By REV. THOMAS LAPE, A. M., Malden, N. Y.

Hannah More has justly styled Catechisation the grammar of Christianity. Admitting the correctness of this definition, then the Sunday-school may be called the alphabet, the first rudiments of Christianity. The Sunday-school is designed to make the beginning in religious knowledge, Catechisation is systematising and extending that knowledge. In the Sunday-school general Bible knowledge is taught, but in Catechisation fundamental principles are inculcated, being deduced from the Bible and sustained by the Bible calculated to increase and deepen our religious knowledge. Catechisation may therefore be defined a systematic course of Theology, pursued by word of mouth, adapted to the comprehension of children, designed to enlighten and expand their

minds, impress their hearts and consciences in their duty both to God and man.

Agreeably to this definition, we find the word Catechisation employed by sacred writers. The Evangelist (Luke 1: 4,) tells Theophilus that he intends to give him an account of those things, in which "he had been instructed, (catechised.)" Again he employs the same word in the same sense in Acts 18: 25, "This man was instructed (catechised) in the way of the soul." The Apostle Paul uses the word in the same sense in Romans 2: 18, "being instructed (catechised) out of the law." Again in 1 Cor. 14: 19, "That by my voice, I might teach, (catechise) others" etc.

This method of inculcating religious knowledge is happily adapted to awaken attention in the minds of the young. Their minds not being trained to habits of close thinking and their memory not being very retentive, they therefore require, in the language of Isaiah 28: 10, "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little." If their attention is once awakened, an important object is attained. If they are interested in the instruction, deep and lasting impressions will be made, impressions that will form their characters for the future, impressions that will lead them to seek in Christ the salvation of their souls. These considerations are abundantly established by the observation and experience of every faithful Pastor in the discharge of his ministerial duties.

This method of imparting religious instructions, has been practiced in all ages of the Church of God. In Gen. 18: 19, God says of Abraham: "For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment." Henry on this passage remarks: "Abraham not only took care of his children, but of his household: his servants were *catechised*." In Ex. 12: 26, 27, we have an instance of catechetical instruction on the nature of the Paschal Lamb: "And it shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you, What mean you by this service? That ye shall say. It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover," etc. In Deut. 6: 2, 6, 7, Moses by the command of the Lord distinctly inculcated religious instruction by Catechisation to Israel: "That thou mightest fear the Lord thy God, to keep all his statutes and his commandments, which I command thee, thou, and thy sons, and thy son's son, all the days of thy life." Again, "And these words which I command thee

this day shall be in thy heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and thou shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up." These Scriptural passages, and more might be selected, are so many evidences that the method of instruction pursued in imparting instruction under the old Dispensation, was by Catechisation. In a word, it is declared on good authority that the proselytes of righteousness of the Jewish Church were catechetically instructed in their religion before they were received to membership.

In the time of Christ, this kind of instruction was practiced. We are told in Luke 2: 46, that Jesus when twelve years of age was, on one occasion in the temple, "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both *hearing and asking them questions.*" Although he taught his disciples everything pertaining to the extension of his Kingdom and the salvation of the soul, yet he at all times accommodated himself to the capacities of children and the uninformed: he may be said to have adopted the method of Catechisation. We have a striking example in Matt. 16: 13. Here he desired to obtain the sentiments of the people respecting himself. He asked the question, "Whom do men say that I the son of man am? And they said, some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremias or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," etc. In these questions and answers, fundamental truths respecting Christ—the stability and permanency of his Church are thus catechetically inculcated by Christ in the minds of his disciples.

The Apostles followed the example of their Great Teacher. Paul in his first Epistle, (Cor. 3: 1, 2,) addressing his converts, he styles them "babes in Christ," and thus feeds them with milk and not with meat. The same language he adopts in Heb. 5: 11, 14. This language evidently denotes the simple and elementary doctrines of Christianity taught by Catechisation. In the 6: 1, the Apostle mentions "the principles of the doctrines of Christ," which like any science could neither be accurately taught nor learned in any other way but by catechisation.

In Ecclesiastical History we find abundant evidences of religious instruction being imparted to the young and the uninformed by catechisation. In the primitive Church.

great attention was bestowed on this subject. Such men as Origen, Ambrose, Cyril, Gregory, Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom with others practiced this important duty.

Examining the historic records we open upon a bright page in the sixteenth century. Luther arose in the spirit of his divine Master, and with the Bible in his hands, attacked the Papal power. Europe awoke from her sleep of spiritual darkness. Luther, with others, was appointed in the year 1527-8 by the Elector of Saxony to go through his dominions on a tour of Church visitation. He found the spiritual condition of the people so low that his very soul was stirred up within him on their behalf. He resolved at once to prepare Catechisms for their improvement, which have exerted a powerful influence not only in hastening on the glorious Reformation but in establishing the cardinal doctrines of the Protestant Church. The Smaller Catechism in particular has been translated into many of the languages of the world. Tens of thousands of copies have been issued through a period of more than three hundred years in various forms, modifications and illustrations.

Not only did Luther strenuously advocate catechisation in the Church of Christ, but all his illustrious coadjutors did the same, in their efforts to advance the glorious Reformation. Calvin says: "The Church cannot be built up without catechisation. Ursinus, the author of the Heidelberg Catechism, says: "That Catechisation is an ordinance of God (for God is the God of the young,) that both parents and children may be instructed in the doctrines of salvation. Hence the catechising, commanded to be connected with the Passover, was a perpetual practice in the Jewish Church.

The Pilgrims who landed on Plymouth Rock in 1620, introduced to this country the practice of catechising their children. In 1629 Matthew Cradboch said: "We appoint that all secular business cease at 3 o'clock on Saturday afternoon, and that the time be spent in catechising." The Colonial records show "that the Legislature ordered that all parents and mothers of families do once in a week catechise their children and that the Selectmen see that this order is obeyed." Cotton Mather said: "That to keep school and catechise the young was a noble work fit for angels."

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in her early history was highly distinguished for this particular branch of religious instruction. In later years, however, in this country in common

with some other portions of the Protestant Church, it has been too much neglected. But a better spirit is awakening. The old paths, in which our fathers trod, are sought out and there is a return again to this branch of religious instructions. Other portions of the Protestant Church feel how important this subject is and are putting forth efforts for the promotion of this good cause. They as well as we perceive that the press is teeming with light and exceptional literature, calculated to pander to the depravity of the heart, and therefore, how necessary it is to instil religious principles early in the minds of the young so as to guard their tender minds against these baneful influences. Catechisation is happily adapted to accomplish this desired object.

Whose duty is it to give Catechetical instructions to the young? Christian parents and Sunday school teachers can render important aid in this great work. But it is especially incumbent upon the Pastor of the Church to furnish Catechetical instructions. This is a work embraced in his commission by the Great Head of the Church. It is a work that comes directly under his supervision as Pastor. *Baptised children are the children of the Church. They in view of the Abrahamic covenant are members of the Church.* The Pastor of the Church cannot fulfil his high commission without attending to the spiritual wants of the children of his charge. The Pastor as a laborer in the vineyard of the Lord must cultivate the tender plants. As a Shepherd he must effectually embrace in his labors the Lambs of the flock. He must fold them in his arms, press them to his bosom and feed them with the milk of the Gospel of Christ, that they may be trained up in the fear and knowledge of the Lord. Christ said: "*Feed my Lambs.*"

*The future usefulness of the young require them to be well instructed.* Secular schools are established by legislation to instruct the young to be obedient and useful citizens of our country. The church of Christ, in her very nature, is a society, united together for great and momentous objects. *It is the salvation of the soul.* Man, in his unregenerate state, is not only opposed to holiness, but inclined to evil. The tendency of sin is gradually downward to a greater degree of guilt. The hope of repentance is thereby lessened as time rolls on. A counteracting influence is therefore necessary to get, as it were, the start of sinful habits, and the prevention of infidel principles. Let children remain uninstructed in the doctrines and precepts of the Bible, and they



will most assuredly imbibe erroneous principles, and their course through life will be ruinous. How evident is this fact among nations, districts and families, where the word of God is received and embraced, or where ignorance of God and of divine things predominate. Spiritual ignorance is every where accompanied with a disregard of the laws of God, and crime is committed. Catechisation is an effectual mode of preaching the word of God. It is happily adapted to the comprehension of children. It is best calculated to awaken their attention, to impress their hearts, to shed into their souls divine light and knowledge, and thus win them over to truth and holiness. Timothy from a child was instructed in the Holy Scriptures, which not only made him wise unto salvation, but when he became a man he greatly excelled other pious men of his day in advancing the Redeemer's kingdom. Men who are trained up from childhood in the principles and the practices of religion, are the most useful in the cause of Christ. Their religious principles being established, their habits of life formed, their aim and object is onward in the path of usefulness. Men thus reared from their childhood in the school of Christ, make the most active members and officers of the church, the most efficient superintendents and teachers of the Sunday School, the ablest ministers of the everlasting Gospel, and the most self-denying missionaries of Christ.

*The advantages derived from catechisation are great.* The pastor himself is benefited. By teaching others, he is taught himself. When a minister, in his pulpit exercises, observes no particular system of doctrinal subjects from year to year, many important truths of the Bible may be overlooked. But if he attends faithfully to the catechisation of the young of his charge, he will feel himself compelled to take up a theological course of instruction. That course will require study. By study he will increase in knowledge. By knowledge his mind will expand, and as his mind expands he will become qualified for greater usefulness in the Christian ministry.

But again, the pastor himself will derive a *spiritual* advantage from attending faithfully to this duty. The fundamental doctrines contained in the Catechism, and the practical duties which are therein inculcated, cannot fail of affecting his heart, when properly pursued and conscientiously attended to. He has an epitome of the Christian system before him. He sees, as it were in a mirror, his spiritual condition in the sight of a holy God, and thus is led to realize his duty

and feel his own personal responsibilities. Luther experienced such beneficial results from a knowledge of the Catechism, that he was in the habit daily of *repeating* it. In his introduction to the Larger Catechism, he says:—“Every morning, and also at other times, I repeat, word for word, the Decalogue, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and some Psalms; and although I thus daily read and study it, yet I cannot advance as I should like, and hence I must continue to be a child, and to be a learner of the Catechism, to which I cheerfully consent.” Did Luther experience beneficial effects in his *daily repetition* of the Catechism? Did this exercise keep the fundamental doctrines of the Bible fresh before his mind? Did it keep him humble, and cause him to feel his own personal responsibility to his God, then the pastor in the faithful instruction of the children of his charge in the Catechism will, in his own soul, experience the same **happy results.**

But it also establishes the minds of his people in *sound doctrine*. Where instructions in the Catechism have been systematically and faithfully pursued, there the minds of the people are well established in the principles of our holy religion. There will be no vagueness, nor indefiniteness in their religious views; they will ever be ready always to give to every man that asketh a reason of the hope within them with meekness and fear. They will adorn their profession by a holy walk and conversation. They will advance in intellectual and religious knowledge. They will more readily coöperate with their pastor in everything that has in view the glory of God and the spiritual good of mankind, than if they were ignorant and unenlightened on these subjects.

Another advantage of Catechisation is the *formation of a particular friendship between the pastor and the children of his charge*. Children are a most important portion of the community. The late lamented Dr. J. W. Alexander said, “*That as the children of the present day, so will be the men and women of the next.*” They will fill all the stations of power and influence, both in Church and in State; hence the necessity, the absolute necessity, of having their minds endowed with heavenly knowledge, and their hearts sanctified by the grace of God, in order that they may be qualified to fulfil their high destiny in the fear of the Lord. The pastor, through the blessing of the Lord, can exert a powerful influence in moulding their minds for the accomplishment

of these great and momentous objects. By securing their friendship, he at once has access to the hidden springs of their souls. He can then pour in spiritual light and knowledge, and lead them in the paths of truth and holiness. Christ in this way moulded the character of his disciples. Bound by the cords of love, he employed them as his agents in advancing his kingdom upon the earth. Children thus converted to God through the Christian pastor's faithful labors, may be the means of the conversion of their parents, if unconverted to God. Who has not seen a shepherd attempting to drive a flock of sheep into good pasture, while they would stray in contrary ways? At length he would take one of the lambs into his arms, press it to his bosom, walk into the pasture lot, when the mother would follow, and finally the whole flock would come in and be well fed. So the Christian pastor, having been the means of the conversion of one of the children of a worldly-minded family, may lead, through the blessing of the Lord, first the parents, and eventually the whole family to Christ, the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, who will feed them with the choicest provisions of his house, and thus constitute them a happy family in the Lord.

The question may arise, how can children be influenced to attend catechetical instruction? I answer, let the pastor preach a sermon to parents on the duty of bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; let him impress upon their minds the solemn vows which they made when they dedicated their children to God in baptism, and urge upon them a compliance with those duties. Let him preach at stated periods, in a plain and affectionate manner, particularly to children, on the importance of seeking the Lord in their childhood, and especially impress upon those dedicated to God in baptism, that they are not their own, but that they belong to the Lord in a solemn covenant: His, they are, Him they are to serve, and Him to glorify in their bodies and spirits, which belong to Him. Thus parents and children will realize their respective obligations to each other and to their God. Motives will be presented, and influences exerted, that will lead children willingly and cheerfully to attend to the religious instruction of their pastor.

How solemn, then, the position of the Christian minister. Souls are committed to his care; temporal and eternal interests depend upon him. As a watchman upon the walls of Zion, his duty requires him to be upon his post, and give the

signal of alarm when temptations assail and dangers threaten. As a shepherd of the flock, he is required to guide them in the path of righteousness and peace. He is, in an especial manner, to protect the young, the lambs of the flock, from the influences of a deceitful world, and, by the grace of God, save their souls from eternal ruin. If he is faithful to his trust, the Lord will bless his efforts with abundant success. They will be his crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord, but if he is unfaithful, then blood will be required at his hands. How responsible his position! How solemn his charge! Well might the great Apostle exclaim: "Who is sufficient for these things?"

Although the Christian pastor's position is one of deep responsibility, yet great encouragements are presented to be faithful in the discharge of duty. Though his station in life may be humble, and comparatively feeble the efforts put forth, yet mighty, through the Lord, may be the influence exerted, and glorious the result. Little did the laudable mother of John Newton imagine, when she instructed him in the Catechism, that she was training one who would become a burning and a shining light to future generations—who would be the means of the conversion of such a man as Claudius Buchanan, who first awakened a foreign missionary spirit; Thomas Scott, the great Commentator of the Bible; Wilberforce, the African's friend, and others of great influence in the world. Little did the pious parents of Philip Doddridge imagine, when they instructed him in scriptural ornamented Dutch Tiles, that he would one day write "The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul," be one of the great expositors of the Bible, and instruct upwards of two hundred young men for the Gospel ministry. Little did the humble father of Martin Luther imagine, when he carried him in his arms to school, or the wife of Conrad Cotta, whose heart moved with pity, fed the poor, hungry young student, who one day stood at her door, singing for bread, that they were aiding and training one who would shake the Papal Church to its centre, commence the great Reformation, translate the Bible in the German language, write Catechisms and Hymns that would illumine the minds, guide the way and cheer the hearts of millions of our race to the realms of eternal day.

Let these examples encourage every Christian minister to activity, diligence and perseverance in the discharge of his duty towards the flock, over which the Holy Spirit has made



him overseer, knowing that his labor will not be in vain in the Lord. What has been accomplished by others, can be accomplished by us, if we are faithful. "The Lord's arm is not shortened that it cannot save, nor his ear heavy that it cannot hear." He is unchangeable in his character. Let us then discharge our duty. By the blessing of God another John Newton, another Philip Doddridge, another Martin Luther, together with hundreds of other kindred spirits may, through our instrumentality, be instructed and blessed, and "shine as the brightness of the firmament in the kingdom of our God."

---

## ARTICLE IX.

THE MYSTICAL UNION.—TRANSLATED FROM SCHMID'S  
DOGMATIK OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

\* By Prof. C. P. KRAUTH, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

The Holy Scriptures assert that God dwells in the believer and expresses by this a peculiar union of God with him, which Theology distinguishes as a Mystical Union. This takes place at the instant, in which man is justified and regenerated, and is inseparably united with justification and regeneration, so that, when with justification, forgiveness, and with regeneration, the power of faith is associated, in the Mystical Union, the direct operation of both these acts of divine grace is described, which consists in this, that he makes his abode in a peculiar manner in the justified or renewed. By this Mystical Union is more expressed than a mere agreement of the will of man with the will of God or a mere union of both in love, or a mere influence and communication of spiritual gifts on the part of the Holy Ghost. The passages John 14: 23; 1 Cor. 6: 15, 17; Eph. 5: 39; 2 Peter 1: 4; Gal. 3: 27; 2: 19, 20, prove that this union is not merely figurative, but proper and actual, so that it can be described as nothing but the union of the substance of God with the substance of man, in consequence of which God pours out the fulness of his gracious gifts upon the regenerate. It is therefore carefully to be distinguished from that indwelling which is mentioned in Acts 17: 28; for if in this passage a substantial



union of God with man is expressed, it must be of a different character from the other, as the one is common to all creatures, the other belongs to believers; therefore one as a special union is distinguished from the other as a general union. This union is characterized further as a Mystical Union (because it is a great mystery, Eph. 5: 32,) the specific mode of this union is unsearchable; then as spiritual, since it is brought about not in a carnal or corporeal, but in a spiritual and supernatural manner by the Holy Spirit, graciously dwelling in the regenerate. As we are unable to give a more specific representation of the nature and manner of this union, we limit ourselves to the removal of erroneous views of it. In the assertion that in this union the two substances, the divine and the human are united, this, not to be understood either, that the two substances become one, or that the one is absorbed in the other, nor as if out of the two persons, God and man, one person would in a like manner as the two natures of Christ constitute one person. The mystical is therefore not a substantial and not a personal union. In regard to the order in which the Mystical Union is arranged with the preceding regeneration and justification, Quenstedt says: Regeneration, justification, union and renovation are simultaneous and more united than a mathematical point, and so cohere that they cannot be separated. According to our mode of conceiving, justification and regeneration are prior in order to the mystical union. When in regeneration a man receives faith, and by faith is justified, then he begins to be mystically united to God. Renovation is subsequent to union, for from good works which are the effects of renovation, as if from the latter, the existence both of justification and the mystical union is ascertained. They follow each other in this order according to our conception. Regeneration precedes, that faith may be attained, justification follows, which is of faith, the mystical union now takes place which is succeeded by renovation and sanctification.

According to another mode of considering it, it can be said that union precedes justification, in as much as faith precedes justification, and in faith as the organ, by which the union is effected, it is already established with it in its incipency. Therefore Hollaz, after consenting to this view, adds: Although the mystical union, by which God dwells in the soul as in a temple, may follow justification according to our conceptions in the order of nature, it is however to be acknowledged, that the formal union of faith, by which Christ is

apprehended, put on, united with us, as a Mediator and the Author of grace and pardon, precedes justification in view of reason. For faith is imputed for righteousness, so far as it receives the merits of Christ and it is united with us and it becomes ours. The union may be conceived as an act, inasmuch as it takes place instantaneously, and is then more particularly to be distinguished as uniting (*unitio*) or the act of union, which is transient and momentary, and takes place at the same time with regeneration and justification, or as a state, a permanent relation of entities already, really and in act united, sustaining to the act the relation of effect to cause.

The mystical union does not consist in the entire harmony and tempering of the affections, as when the soul of Jonathan is said to be united to David, 1 Sam. 18: 1, but in a true, real, proper and most intimate union, for Christ; John 17: 21, uses the phrase, to be in some one, which implies the real presence of the thing, which is said to be in, not figuratively as a lover in the beloved. The mystical union does not consist alone in the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit in believers. For when Christ says John 13: 23, I and my father, &c., &c., and 16, the Holy Spirit &c., these are not names of operations but persons. And it is entirely wanton, to convert such emphatic words and expressing a reality, with which this mystical union is described, into mere energetic expressions, for example, to come, to be sent into the heart, to dwell, to remain, to live in any one. They are personal properties and not properties of operation. Hollaz defines thus: The mystical union is the spiritual conjunction of the triune God with justified man, by which he dwells in him as in a consecrated temple by his special presence and that too, substantial, and operates in the same by his gracious influence. Quenstedt. The mystical union is the real and most intimate conjunction of the substances of the sacred Trinity and the God-man Christ with the substance of believers, effected by God himself through the Gospel, the sacraments of faith by which through a special approximation of his essence and gracious operation he is the same, and as they are in him, that by a mutual and reciprocal nearness they may partake of his vivifying power and all his mercies, become assured of the grace of God and eternal salvation, and preserve unity in the faith and love with all the other members of his mystical body. The Form of Concord presents the mystical union in that it (3, 65) exhibits the assertion as false, that not

God himself, but the gifts alone dwell in believers. The extremes or terms of the mystical union are then so represented: the essences of the subjects to be united, and on the one part the divine substance of the whole trinity 2 Peter 1: 4, and the substance of the human nature of Christ, John 15: 1, 2, 4; 1 Cor. 6: 15—17; Eph. 5: 30; Gal. 2: 19, 20. On the other part, the substance of believers, as the body and soul, 1 Cor. 6: 15, 19; Eph. 5: 30. The form of this union consists, in a true, real, intrinsic and most close conjunction of the substance of the believer with the substance of the Holy Trinity and the flesh of Christ. Hollaz. Two things pertain to the form of the mystical union, a true and real *adhaerentia* a nearness for the approximation of the divine essence to the believer, whereby the three-one God comes to us and makes his abode with us, which is not then merely a naked operation without the approach of God but a near access to us, or an advent, that he may remain in us, John 14: 23: a gracious energy or operation, whereby God comes to us and dwells in us, that he fills us with all the fulness of his wisdom, holiness, power and other divine gifts, Eph. 3: 18, which imparts his mystic inhabitation, whereby God is in us and remains through grace; but we are in God, and adhere to him in trust, so that nothing can separate us from God, who are united by faith, Rom. 8: 38 *et seq.* Quenstedt proves the mystical union, from the promise of Christ, John 14: 23, 26; 15: 26. To come to any one imports accession and approximation to him, and thus the advent of the Sacred Trinity to believers and the presence not only of his gifts but likewise of his essence. From the indwelling in believers, Eph. 3: 17; Rom. 8: 9; 2 Cor. 6: 10. From the unity of believers with God, John 17: 21. The gradation which Christ uses in this place, indicates the spiritual union, whereby He, v. 23, is in believers, to be more intimate, than that by which the believers, v. 21, are one with God by the communion of the spirit, and likewise in the mode and form it differs from that which is described in v. 22, where believers are said to be one on account of the unity of faith, love and hope, for there is superadded an amplification of the consummation: "I in them and thou in me, that they may be united in one," from the communication of the divine nature 2 Peter 1: 4. This mystical union is further described in the Sacred Scriptures, by the expression, the espousal of believers with Christ, Hos. 2: 19, the mystical marriage of Christ and the Church, Eph. 5: 32, the union of the members of the head.

Eph. 1 : 22, 23, the insertion of the spiritual branches in the spiritual vine, Christ, John 15 : 4--7, the abiding of the whole Trinity with renewed man, John 14 : 23.

Hollaz. The general union, whereby all believers and unbelievers live, and move, and have their being in God. As fishes in water and birds in the air, so all men live, and move, and are in God, because he gives to all life and breath and all things. Quenstedt. That general union of all men with the substance of God, the Creator, is indicated in Acts 17 : 28, where the preposition "in" expresses the general presence of God with men. Hugo Grotius explains it by a Hebraism so that in him, would be, by him, by his favor. But there is, no necessity of receding from the ordinary acceptation of it. For neither is the origin only expressed, that we are of him, but in addition, the divine presence, that in him we live, and move and are.

The special union is partly a gracious one in the Church militant, whereby God dwells in the regenerate by his substantial presence, and operates in them by his special influences—John 14 : 23 ; 17 : 11, 21, and partly a glorious one in the triumphant assembly of the elect, whereby God fills and delights the elect with the plenitude of his grace. As therefore in the general union there is likewise a connection of the divine substance with man, and not merely a gracious operation, the special union is distinguished from this in this way, that in it a new approximation of the divine essence, and different from the Omnipresence takes place, which is so limited to the believer, that the divine substance cannot be present in this way to the wicked and other creatures, and thus the manner of the presence in this union is expressed by a new approximation of the substance. In reply to the objection: Whatever as to its substance is already present, in that whilst it is present, it is necessarily present, nor can it be absent, and therefore it cannot be said that it comes, draws nigh, or approximates by its substance anew, but the Sacred Trinity as to its substance or the divine essence by the common and general essence, is already present to all creatures, and likewise to believers; therefore he cannot approach them by a new and special presence. Quenstedt answers : 1, The substance of the Holy Spirit wishes to unite itself in a peculiar manner with the dove, and thus to manifest itself to the Baptist, so that where the dove might be, there it could correctly and truly be said, the substance of the Holy Spirit was present in that peculiar kind of presence, that the divine essence, as



essence, could admit of such an approximation without the danger of its losing immensity, the peculiar presence in Christ proves, in whom the divine nature is so united to the human, that in this way it is neither necessary that it should be elsewhere, nor does it desire to be, which presence is certainly not determined by a new mode of operating, but by a nearness of a substance, not distant to the nearness of a substance. And although this presence is very peculiar, yet it cannot be denied, which may be deduced from the hypostatical union, that such an approximation is not entirely repugnant to the divine nature. And the position is constantly maintained that, as the union is not specially a mere gracious operation of the Holy Spirit, so the special union does not separate itself from the general by a new and special mode of operating, but by a new approximation of the essence, and that distinct from that common mode of essence. Quenstedt. This union does not consist in transubstantiation, or the conversion of one substance into the substance of Christ or of God, or *vice versa*, as the rod of Moses was converted into a serpent. Nor in consubstantiation, so that of two united essences there is formed one substance. Hollaz. God dwells in us, as in temples, by the mercy of the mystical union, 1 Cor. 3: 16; but the habitation is not changed into the inhabitant, nor the inhabitant into the habitation; by the mystical union we put on Christ, Gal. 3: 27, but the garment is not essentially one with the person who wears it; the divine nature is very distinct from the human, although God comes to us and makes his abode with us, John 14: 23, for he can depart from man to whom he has come. The mystical union is, therefore, called a union of substances, but strictly takes not a formal substantial union (such as is a branch which coalesces with the trunk into the essence of three numerically one), but it is an accidental union. If then a substantial, as by man, it is not from the mode of union, but the terms, because a human substance is united to a divine.

Quenstedt. The mystical union does not consist in a personal union or coalition of extremes united into hypostasis or person, such as is the union of the divine and human in Christ, so that the believer united to Christ can say, I am Christ. Hollaz. Paul teaches that Christ and believers, being mystically united, remain distinct, Gal. 2: 20. Quenstedt adds the mystic union from the sacramental union and communion. The opposition to this is, 1, The Weigellians and



Schwenkfeldians, deciding that the mystic union with God, as to its mode, is essential and corporeal; 2. of some Scholastics, Papists, Socinians and Arminians, denying, that God remains in the faithful, in a special mode of substantial presence.

## ARTICLE X.

### RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN.\*

By GEORGE C. MAUND, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

WE ought never to forget that to be a citizen of a representative Republic is a great privilege which imposes solemn responsibility. Under an oligarchy or a despotism this is not so, or at least not to the same degree. When by the framework of his government he has no part in the administration of affairs, no voice in the election of rulers, the enactment of laws, or the choice of public measures, the citizen must feel that at best he is impotent to impress his country's destiny. He may, indeed, cultivate in himself and others the amenities and charities of life, he may do something to foster the growth of science and of art, and by the permission and under the auspices of an enlightened and benevolent ruler,—such as fortune will occasionally vouchsafe,—he may adopt and employ many of the agencies that have been found useful in ameliorating the condition of man. Still, as regards the great questions of the foreign and domestic policy of his country, questions the decision of which determines the character of his nation at home and its relations to foreign powers, which affect its honor, its integrity, its renown, questions of extreme importance presented by urgent crises, in a word, as regards all those great acts, measures and resolves of government which direct the career of his country, determine its fate and create for it a history among the nations, the citizen or subject of a despotism knows that he is dumb and powerless, that he must passively walk as he is led, and that he must muse in silence his aspirations for that better

\*An Address, delivered before the Alumni of Pennsylvania College, September 10th, 1861, and published by request of the Association.

day when man's individual dignity and equality shall be confessed and realized.

It is far otherwise under a republican form of government where supreme power is exercised by the people. Let it be observed that I am not now insisting upon any superior excellence in this form of government, although I do not doubt it, but I am claiming attention to the graver and more pressing weight of responsibility which under this form of government attaches to the citizen. The welfare and destiny of the Commonwealth are at last in his hands. Upon the wisdom and fidelity, the courage and devotion with which he meets and discharges his duties, its safety, prosperity and honor depend. It is true that under this, as under other forms of government, the powers of government must be immediately exercised, not by the citizens in their aggregate mass, but by agents, or officers. There must be agents to enact the laws, and agents to execute them, and agents to decide, for the time being, the measures and policy by which affairs shall be conducted; still as these agents are chosen by himself, and as it is a fundamental maxim in every well-considered system of representative government that the office-holder's term of service must be of comparatively limited duration, it is next to impossible for the state to be overthrown, or radically damaged by its government except by the failure of the citizen himself to perform his duty. Upon him it devolves to elect capable and worthy men to office; and upon him it devolves to pass sentence upon the acts and measures of those in office and to remove from office such as have betrayed his trust. So we perceive, without further expansion of this train of thought, that under a republican form of government, the weal or the woe, the prosperity or adversity of the people, so far as these things depend at all upon government (and they do to an almost incalculable extent,) rest with the people themselves; they are their own governors. Now while these prerogatives and this power confer upon the citizen true dignity and grandeur, they also exact from him the most solemn regard to the duties with which these prerogatives and this power are associated. For power is always associated with duty, and no power is more important than that which controls the happiness and destiny of a nation.

What I have thus far spoken it will be seen, is of general application. It applies to the citizens not of one, but of all republics, whether of this or of former times, which are re-

ally representative and are controlled by the people. It applies equally to that diminutive republic of Andorre, which confined in its sway to the limits of a narrow valley, is unnoticed beyond the Pyrenean hills which overshadow it, as to that of mighty Rome which unfurling her victorious standards to every breeze proudly dictated her laws to the world. Under *all* such governments the position of citizen must be clothed with great dignity and solemn responsibility; but how much greater is the dignity, and how immeasurably weightier the responsibility of a citizen of the Republic of the United States.

It is not a self-complacent conceit of our national vanity, but the deliberate judgment of the most enlightened minds of Europe, expressed repeatedly, and in every form, that the great problem of man's capacity for self-government is being solved by the American people—that to us is confided the fate of free republican institutions throughout the world—that the ark of the covenant between man and man, securing to each equal rights and equal dignity before the law, is entrusted to our keeping, and that if it be shattered in our hands, or be wrested from our protecting grasp, it will be difficult to perceive and hard to imagine even that another people, more highly favored, will ever arise upon the earth who will be able to preserve and defend what we have disastrously lost. And surely there is much reason for believing (I will not say *fearing*) that this view is not incorrect, and that it does not overstate or exaggerate the critical and awful connection between the fate of our beloved country and that of our common humanity. I say there is reason for believing this when we consider the auspicious beginning of freedom in our land, the triumphant success by which her rule has been vindicated, and the resplendent future which she has displayed and seemed to secure for us and our posterity. Never before was a government so freely and deliberately adopted by the people as this. "Delegates were appointed to the convention which framed our Constitution to deliberate and propose. They met and performed their delegated trust. The result of their deliberations was laid before the people. It was discussed and scrutinized in the fullest, freest and severest manner, by speaking, by writing and by printing, by individuals and by public bodies, by its friends and by its enemies," and the result was, it was ratified and adopted. I need not rehearse, what is known to us all, the magnificent and unparalled progress which our people have made for

some seventy years, in arts and sciences, in commerce and manufactures, in agriculture and mechanical inventions, under the operations of this free government thus deliberately adopted; the consideration in which they have been held abroad, and the individual and general happiness which they had enjoyed at home. It is enough to say that we had reached a commanding height of prosperity and power that won for us the proud title of the Great Republic, that our example had become the fear of tyrants—the hope of the oppressed; and was compelling throughout the civilized world the admission, willing or reluctant, that the only form of government entitled to man's respect and acceptance is that which is based upon the natural rights and inborn dignity of our common nature. If to this be added that we have been possessed of an almost boundless domain of virgin soil, washed by the Atlantic and Pacific, pierced by numberless navigable streams and rivers, and upon which nature had bountifully lavished her choicest stores of wealth with profuse hand, it may well be asked, when freedom shall perish here, where will she survive? If she be compelled to take her flight from these favored shores, in what more congenial clime may we expect that she will find an abode? It is to be feared that such questions must meet a sad response, and that our failure to preserve inviolate the precious heritage of our institutions would not only be a misfortune and a calamity to ourselves, but a deadly and irreparable shock to freedom everywhere.

How serious and responsible a position then is held by the American citizen; serious and responsible, yet imposing and grand. Yes, even in our days of anxiety and sorrow, of gloom and danger and apprehension, it is a proud and glorious privilege to be an American citizen. Ought I not rather say, *more* proud, *more* glorious, *because* of the gloom and danger? It is a fair and good and pleasant thing to love one's country, and to support and cherish her beneficent institutions and laws in the days of prosperity, and sunshine and tranquility, but when the storm falls, and darkness that may be felt is upon the land, and old friends turn away and become foes, and once beloved fellow countrymen draw the sword of treason, and the fair pillars of his government are made to reel and totter, and to threaten anarchy and chaos by their fall, it is a proud and glorious privilege to be an American citizen then—however humble—standing up, erect and resolute; unmoved, immovable in the cause of country,



of truth, of freedom and of the inalienable and eternal rights of our common humanity. These are days that try men's souls by an ordeal more severe, I suspect, than that of '76. The true men of those times have received the grateful and well-deserved homage of their children, and I would not appear enviously to disparage their renown by challenging a comparison of great deeds, but I would venture to express the belief that the day is coming, and that not far distant, when the genius of poetry, of eloquence and history will earnestly contend together for the honor of weaving the choicest crown of glory for the true and loyal men of this generation.

Such being the responsible position of the American citizen, it may not be inappropriate, on this occasion, to submit briefly, a few reflections upon some of the qualities by which he should be distinguished.

It is often urged that the safety and durability of republican institutions are to be found in the virtue and general intelligence of the people; that if there be a fair diffusion of moral and intellectual culture, the foundations of the State are secure; that in ignorance and licentiousness alone, are to be discerned the seeds of decay and dissolution.

Now in avowing the opinion that such general statements are not strictly true and worthy of unqualified acceptance, it will not be thought that I would undervalue the inappreciable importance of virtue, piety, and popular education. It is knowledge which exalts a man, and a pious and virtuous life which alone confers genuine beauty and worth. But let it be remembered that while we apply to the rebellious war now waged for the destruction of this nation, the strangest epithets in the language expressive of its immoral character, such as wicked, unholy, and unrighteous, we are all at the same time, compelled in candor to admit that very many men, intelligent, and hitherto pure and blameless in their conduct, are engaged in its support.

Now I grant that there may be a certain high degree of mental culture, of pious emotion and enlightened morality, easily imagined, but rarely realized, which concurring, would form the perfect citizen, as well as the perfect man. But, taking men as they actually appear in the world, the better specimens of them too, and it will be found that they need special training for each particular department of duty. To rely upon mere general culture of the mind and heart, as a sufficient education of the citizen as to his duties, is not un-



like strengthening the body of a man by athletic exercises, and commanding him, when the battle-cry is raised, to perform valiantly in the fight, with a sword which he has never learned to handle, or a musket which he has never been taught to fire. All experience shows that the Christian, however filled with pious emotion, needs to be instructed in particular virtues and virtuous habits; that the well-disposed merchant is none the worse for being taught the ethics of contracts; and that the knavish practices of trade, acquiring from custom a seeming respectability, delude even honest men into their adoption. This necessity for special training is grounded in the fact that our virtues, unfortunately, do not always work out their *logical* results; and that the inconsequentiality of human nature is such, that the generic virtue does but seldom bear in its bosom all those special virtues which would seem to be its indefeasable offspring.

In view of these considerations, it may be matter for serious regret that this subject of good citizenship has not received more direct and special attention in our schools and universities; that more pains have not been taken to imbue the impressible minds of youth with just notions of the serious and important character of their obligations as citizens of the republic; to possess them with some clear conceptions of the leading maxims by which they should be guided in the performance of their duties, as well as some of the mistakes and delusions by which they may be misled, and that at least something more had not been done, or attempted, to save them, when passing into the arena of active life, from becoming the dupes of designing demagogues, and the unconscious agents of their country's woe.

Now America needs in her citizens an ardent love of country, patriotism. Patriotism! too old as a subject for discussion, and yet the praise and admiration of all ages! the truest glory of a people; their sleepless guardian in peace, their only bulwark in times of danger and of war. You may contemplate its heroic sacrifices wherever the sun has shone. Wherever eloquence has spoken, or poesy has sung, you will note that their noblest utterances and sweetest strains have patriotism for their theme. And yet with what deceptive art do we find the false to counterfeit the true. In a certain sense patriotism is an instinct: the beast fights for his lair, the savage claims for his home the wilderness of woods in which he roams, and will contest its possession, along with his tribe, no individual of which, perhaps, he loves, against

the stranger who intrudes. But as an instinct, uninstructed and uninformed, it is blind, hasty and uncertain in its action. It resists equally an invasion to restore, as one to overthrow; an invasion to protect, as one to desolate and destroy. Among the ignorant rabble of Spain, in 1813, it had nearly succeeded in turning the sword of St. James and of Spain against the English, their allies and friends, who came to deliver them from the French. The alien soldier, boldly treading their soil, and assuming, though on behalf of their country's cause, the manner of an owner, they could, in their ignorant way, look on but as invaders. As an instinct, patriotism somewhat resembles that other instinctive affection, the love of a child for its parent. Now does any man doubt that the child, with all its wealth of natural affections, needs to be trained to filial honor and reverence, that he may be unwavering in his obedience to his parents, and become the pride and the stay of their age? So is it with the citizen. He needs to be *trained* in a true love of country, and a just conception of the manner in which such love is to be exhibited, if he will be a true son of the Republic, whom she can look to with confidence for support in her day of trial and of need.

For, I repeat it, the Republic needs of her children patriotism, patriotism in no mean, perverted or restricted sense, but in the fullest sense of the word; not a light, uncertain love which, like the marsh-light, glimmers first here, then there, and the next moment is gone forever; but she expects of them, and has a right to demand of them, a constant, elevated, unselfish, far-reaching and intense devotion of soul to their country, their whole country, that entire body politic, that great national unit in whose allegiance they were born, and to which their allegiance is eternally due; a love which, ever burning in the soul with a pure, bright, lambent flame, shall in her day of trial, *scorch to ashes* the accumulated dress and rubbish of party prejudices, antiquated Mason and Dixon lines, imaginary notions of conflicting local interests, and idolized peculiar institutions. It is amazing to what vile uses in these modern days the sacred name of patriotism has been put; what damning deeds of treason it has been made to consecrate; why these bold, bad men of our times, unblushingly steal this "livery of Heaven to serve the Devil in." In their seats in the Halls of Congress, they plot for the overthrow of that very Constitution they are sworn to support; and dispatching their schemes to their fellow-conspira-

tors at home ; they call that patriotism. In Tennessee, North Carolina, and some other States, they overwhelm by the force of skilful combination the enorganized opposition of loyal majorities to rebellious minorities, scaring and hectoring men into treason against their will, and call that patriotism ! Because the Constitution of the United States did *not* accept African slavery as its chief corner-stone, they have shed frightful torrents of precious human blood, to establish a form of government that *does*, and they call *that* patriotism ! I have known men in my own city, not strangers and adventurers thrown by the tide of commerce on our shores, *but natives of the soil*, men, not clad in rags, and haggard from penury, but rich men, clothed in purple, and faring sumptuously every day ; I have known such hail with pleasure the South Carolina movement, and wish it success in dissolving the Union, for no other reason than that, in that auspicious event, *Baltimore would become the great metropolis of the Southern Confederacy* ! The same men, if residing in Richmond, upon the same principle would desire the Southern Confederacy to be dismembered, that Richmond might become the metropolis of a second Southern Confederacy ; if living in Charleston, they would desire a further dismemberment, to make Charleston the emporium of a third Confederacy, and so on ; thus, from mere greed of gain, holding views which, if generally adopted, would split every great nation into fragments, and render its integrity impossible, and yet these men, these greedy Shylocks, whetting the paracidal sword upon their avaricious souls, these treacherous political Judases, betraying their country for thirty pieces of silver, will talk to you of patriotism.

I cannot understand or conceive of a patriotism which does not rise to the dimensions of the whole country of which a man is a citizen, or that dwarfs itself to a particular State or section. Would that be patriotism in a Spaniard which circumscribes itself within the boundaries of old Castile, as the home of the chivalry of the "Sangre Azul?" or within the boundaries of the rival Aragon ? If so, the Spanish State could not exist. Is he a true German who knows only the Bavarian land, or the Rhine land as his country ? Or he who despite the formal lines which kings and princes, for their selfish objects, maintain, looks but at all Germany as the land of heart and home ? No, the true German knows that consanguinity, language, contiguity, make a nation, in spite of

kings and of parties. He recollects that in the war of Deliverance, men did not fight for Prussia or Hanover, but for Germany; and that in 1807, although Saxony might be the petted ally of Napoleon, and Prussia alone be conquered, yet it was all Germany that suffered the common humiliation. True patriotism must elect the true object, for it is a genuine worship of the heart, not an idolatry. It must select the true object, else it is injurious, not beneficial. It tends else to divide and to narrow, not to draw men together into those widely extended fellowships which are at once the creatures and the creators of civilization. It must be for that political unit which a man terms his nation, his country, and with which his real interests and concernments are in truth and in fact bound up. If it be for anything less than this, then it is a delusive and self-obstructive feeling, for the simple reason that it is directed away from the natural to a factitious object, and hence cannot stand the test of experience. For what is patriotism but a love? And where do all those treasures which our affections have garnered up from the first moments of conscious life lie? In what limits are all those interests which have, one by one, attached their cords to our hearts? In what body are all those multiplex and multiplied concernments in which we willingly or unwillingly have a part, included? In our own State, be it Pennsylvania or Maryland? No, in our country! The very word bears testimony: for who, by that word, has ever meant less than the territory covered by the flag of the Union? Nowhere else but in an old number of the Southern Quarterly Review, published in Charleston, did I ever read that South Carolina was a *nation* indeed, and that the blessed territory from the Cape Fear river to the Savannah, was the *COUNTRY* of the Carolinians. This was thirty years ago, when they were busy contending that obedience alone was due to the United States, but allegiance, the true and lasting tie that binds the patriot to his country, was due to South Carolina, because she, like another heavenly Jerusalem, was "the mother of them all." Experience, proverbially styled the teacher of fools, has at last taken these men in hand, and imprinted, let us hope, a lesson on their hearts. It has shown them and us that every man is really more connected with, more interested, yes, vastly more, in the country at large, than he is with his own little State. How many times has the Constitution of Maryland been changed in the last fifty years. Yet I, and not one in ten of her citizens, can recollect the dates



To what humble individual did the prospect of such change give a wakeful night? Who found himself a dollar poorer or richer under the new, than under the old Constitution? Twice have her boundaries been in dispute, and are to this day unsettled. Yet no cloud of fear of war has thence spread over her horizon. Her immediate neighbor, Virginia, has passed through like changes; and in the days of men, yet living, underwent even the knife of division, and yielded to the solicitations of Congress the severance of her vast western territory, and her vaster claims. Yet the survivors of those days have no tales to tell us of universal alarm, of public shock or of blood. Yet how different is it with the government of the country. Who could, in the most quiet times, have proposed other than mere formal changes in *its* Constitution, without alarming every proprietary interest? without agitating every man's breast with fear and uncertainty? When was *its* boundary ever in dispute, that the war-cloud did not rise in the sky?

Now, this country, the only proper object of our patriotic love, whose history has been the unbroken record of glories and blessings to us and to our fathers, this country, this day and this hour, assailed by treason, and in the convulsive throes, of a struggle for existence itself, appeals in earnest, pleading, solemn tones to her children, one and all, to be true and faithful in the path of duty. In what spirit will the true citizen respond to the call? Who are the men, I beg you to consider, who are the men to whom, in these days of tribulation, the Republic must owe her deliverance? I speak now, not of the soldiers in the field, but of citizens at home. Is it to the men who sigh for peace, and are willing, at any price, to receive it? Is it to the men who, ready enough at first to resent national outrage and insult, to resist dissolution and ruin, have become weary of a prolonged contest, and doubtful of the result? who quake at the rumor of a rebel incursion, and who, faint-hearted, perceive destruction to the Union cause, in every reverse to the Union arms? No, but to those who, from the beginning, have heard the wail of sorrow, and have seen and felt from their inmost souls the infinite depth of national disgrace which must await our defeat; who, with calmness, viewing the resources of the Republic, have deliberately resolved that eternal war is better than blasted hope of free government; and that no evils, no pains are so intolerable as those ever enduring execrations of mankind, which will rest upon those who, being the chosen guardians of free



institutions, have shown themselves unwilling or incompetent to defend them.

No greater calamity could befall us as a people, than this terrible war, except an ignoble peace. I think no man can predict the end of this strife. Its course may yet lie through years of toil and fields of carnage; army after army may sleep upon the field in the cold embrace of death. The garments of the Republic may be dyed in blood, and her treasure exhausted. We may be called on for more personal self-sacrifice than our enemies have shown, but be it ever so long a contest, be our homes desolate and our hearths deserted, the sure triumph, at last, is to patient, enduring, indomitable fortitude; the dawn of perpetual freedom will be heralded by that virtue, and by that alone. It is the spirit, the earnest, persistent, unconquerable spirit of Warsaw's last champion, who saw his country, the country of his heart still, beneath the waste of ruin with which its fair features had been marred by his Vandal foe—

“What though destruction strew these lovely plains,  
Rise fellow-men, our country yet remains.”

It is the spirit which shone forth in the speech of that Union officer, who, when a prisoner in Virginia, under a rebel guard, addressed them upon the state of the country, and told them to go on to burn Washington, sack Baltimore and Philadelphia, that he wanted them to do so, that only then would the Northern heart be aroused to proper earnestness in the prosecution of the war.

Throughout the continuance of this contest, a great multitude will be oscillating; now elated, and now depressed. The report of a victory will make them strong, and the rumor of a defeat will depress them equally.

There were those in Holland who, during the eighty years of her terrible conflict with Spain, sighed for the return of that commerce which had made her a State. Thousands among her people were daily and nightly oppressed with the thought that to wage war with a nation of the power and resources of Spain, was futile, and that only folly could advise, and ruin follow it. But while cities were plundered and sacked, whole counties laid waste, her bravest and noblest slaughtered, the men of unflinching heart still persevered, and the little sand bank, carved out of the sea, maintained an unequal contest for near three fourths of a century, and triumphed at last. The ocean was let in, when arms were unequal to the conflict; the unrelenting sea buried the

national selfishness beneath its bosom, and the Lake of Havelaam, which was drained but yesterday, gave forth, after centuries, its buried witnesses to the noble sacrifices of a people who were true to themselves and their destiny.

Surprised and confounded as we have been by the proportions of the Rebellion we have not been more overwhelmed and mistaken than the national enemy. They thought, trade and wealth had so demoralized the Northern people, that ease was necessary to life. When they fired upon Fort Sumpter they thought the echo of the guns at the North would be *peace*, but the echo said *War!* They thought the sound reverberating from the Green Mountains all along the Alleghanies would be *Aristocracy forever*; but the old Granite Hills replied *Democracy forever!* They assured themselves that throughout the demoralized Republic the response would be *Slavery always and everywhere*, but the universal defiant reply, even from the central States was *Free Labor forever and Slavery nowhere*—nowhere, if it demands the destruction of American unity; and mighty hosts of valorous men in arms, confronting them this day attests the fatal error of their views.

Those of our fellow-citizens who dread the issue of the war, who expect that through all the embarrassments of unforeseen trials, failures and misfortunes and blunders will not come, who fondly hoped that the children of the Republic could spring forth at her call from all the employments of civil life, not only with souls full of love and self-sacrifice for her, but with all the experience of hardy veteran troops, who thought that to wield the scythe was to learn to wield the sword have necessarily been mistaken.

Military experience is learned upon the field alone, and the bravest are a mob until they have acquired a knowledge, to be derived from the actual practice of war. And those of our countrymen who breathe with pain every morning, lest the public papers may announce a defeat, should remember the day of trial of other lands, and other people, before they were thought worthy to wear the crown of empire and to bear the sceptre of a continent.

For sixteen long years, without victory did the Republic of Rome contend with her Carthaginian foe. Her eagles were driven from Spain across the Alps; her colonies devastated, and consul upon consul, with consular army after army, slain or destroyed. When Hannibal met Varro at Cannae three consular armies and one fourth of the fighting popula-

tion of Rome had been—not defeated, but slaughtered, not routed, but destroyed.

What fortitude was here! what indomitable firmness! What think you our people would feel or think were they tomorrow to learn that the three great armies of the Republic, in Virginia, in Georgia, and in the South-West, were destroyed, and that from the army of the Potomac, three thousand men had only escaped! How would their hearts be appalled as they walked the streets to see the badge of mourning on every door! Such was Rome after the battle of Cannae; but God intended for her the Empire of the World, and the hearts and words of the people were being fitted for so high a design. Her Senate immediately met, and with a wisdom, not deemed doubtful in that ancient Republic, since her sons were slaughtered, called on her *slaves* to defend Rome.

There are those of our countrymen who unwavering in their country's cause, yet forgetful of the lessons which history has already taught, seem inclined to have them repeated. They sigh for a stronger hand at the helm—constantly pray for a great military head—a Bonaparte and a Caesar to lead the armies of the Republic. It appears to me that Providence has been kinder to us than we have asked, and thought, in vouchsafing to us no such man. The purpose of the nation is not only to put down the Rebellion, but to *sustain the existence of the Republic*. We hope now not to be required to ask ourselves, when the war is over who shall seize the sword from him who wields it. Not every great hero is a William of Orange, or a Washington. They are the wonders of a thousand years. Many a nation before us has had the man for which these mistaken people sigh, and but two nations have survived him. Think you, what constitutes a people *great*? Is it that they can put great armies into the field? Is it that with unexampled credit, founded upon immense resources, they lavish millions to maintain them there. No! but that to all these things they superadd an indomitable fortitude, a generous willingness for personal sacrifice, and deprivation that the right, whereof they are guardians, may stand firm and triumph.

But there is another important truth illustrated by this contest which it were well for the good citizen to remember—I mean the necessity that exists in times of sedition and rebellion for *prompt* and *decided* adhesion to the cause of government and law. No one doubts the right of revolution

in cases of extreme and insupportable oppression, for which there is no other adequate remedy. If the citizen in any case feels that he is not compelled to support rebellion, then in that case he *is* compelled by his solemn obligations of citizenship to aid in its suppression. There is no middle ground. There is a law of Solon which has occasioned much perplexity to the Commentators. Plutarch declares that he, to whom God has committed the care of government, "will receive, and to his power imitate the rest of Solon's ordinances, but will doubt and wonder what it was that induced him to decree that he, who, when there arises a sedition in the city, adheres to neither party, should be reputed infamous," and Mr. Grote tells us that "among the various laws of Solon there are few that have attracted more notice than that which pronounces the man who in a sedition stood aloof, and took part with neither side, to be dishonored and disfranchised."

Plutarch unreservedly condemns the ordinance of Solon, and advocates almost in their very words, the position of neutrality assumed by many well-meaning Border-State men at the opening of the contest, and which, had it been consistent with any correct view of the citizen's duty, was soon demonstrated by experience to be utterly impracticable in a severe and prolonged contest for national existence. "Yet does it not become you," says he, "in the time of sedition, to sit as if you were neither sensible, nor sorry, praising your own unconcernedness as a quiet and happy life, and taking delight in others' errors, but on such occasions chiefly should you put on the buskin of Theramenes, and conferring with *both parties, join yourself to neither*, for you will not seem a stranger by not being a partaker of injustice, *but a common friend to them all by your assistance*." Grote, more nearly comprehending the meaning of Solon says, in effect, that his law was intended to discourage the ambitious mal-content by impressing upon his mind the conviction that not every man who was not actively in his favor, would be actively against him, and that this would render his enterprise much more dangerous. But Grote, if he had written during this war might have seen that the law of Solon contained a still profounder wisdom, strikingly illustrated by one of the most astounding phenomena of these times; he would have seen that the leaders of sedition will almost inevitably conquer into submission all men, by whom they are not resolutely opposed—that being for the most part men of passionate zeal,



unscrupulously adopting the most violent and flagitious measures, they will in time overwhelm the very minds and souls of all who do not act as promptly and sternly as themselves. If one-half of the Southern people, opposed in the outset to disunion, had deemed, as Solon did, that neutrality was *infamous*, and had promptly, and before a military despotism was fastened upon their neck, seized arms to defend the country, which they felt ought not to be destroyed, the Rebellion would have been strangled at its birth.

Had the men, or a large proportion of the men who opposed the alliance of Virginia with the unholy cause she now defends, resolved to stand defiantly against the rude efforts to swerve her from her allegiance the fate of the nation would not now be trembling in the balance, and the *mother of Presidents*, would have had the prouder satisfaction of being the *mother of Patriots*!

I haste to leave an unexhausted theme. There is one thought that claims a word in closing. It has been said that offences must needs come, while indeed the malediction is not withheld from those by whom they come. I have long regarded our present troubles as the sure result of forces unavoidable and irresistible, and have seen that many fair villages, hamlets and fields were doomed to bear the stains of fratricidal strife. In this conviction I have felt that it was indeed a matter of felicitation that while other towns have been desolated and despoiled, without acquiring fame, it has been the better fortune of this, the home of *Alma Mater*, to give both place and name to the most memorable battle and victory of the Republic.

In the earlier months of this war, seeking to gain some military knowledge, I was studying the great campaign of Bonaparte, in Italy, of 1796. I called to my aid the largest map that I could find, of the North Italian States. So expanded was its scale, I was continually tempted to mistake neighboring hamlets for cities separated by extended distances. Yet in vain I explored that map, once and again, for Marengo. Picking up, however, my old school atlas, the first name that encountered my eye, was Marengo. There it stood, prominent, in full capitals. For a time I was puzzled by its incongruous omission from the large map. But I soon found the solution; it was engraved in the year 1794 when the battle of Marengo had not been fought. It was reserved for that great battle—a battle which, for a term of years, determined the fate of Italy—to bring forth that



name from its local obscurity, to cause the hitherto unnoticed site, one at this day marked out to the eye of the traveler by but a single dwelling-house on the border of a large grain growing plain, to become a spot of world-wide and historic significance; thenceforth to appear forever in the map of Italy, there to claim the eye of the student, and to shine forth in the group of its illustrious places along with Genoa, Florence and Milan.

So shall it be with Gettysburg! The student, of after times, in India, or England or the Sandwich Islands, will not in vain look on the map of the United States for Gettysburg! And the youth who shall hereafter repair to this honored seat of learning, in the surrounding stretch of hills, and vales and wood, which here shall greet his eye will observe, not that pleasing landscape merely upon which our eyes have lingered, in those happy by-gone days. Round Top, Culp's Hill and Seminary Ridge are *now* all classic ground, hallowed by the blood of the martyred children of the Republic. Yes, the young Academic, while fondly musing here over anticipations of his after life, and of the generous deeds that shall embellish it, will see in the turf which enwraps the patriot dead, and the monumental shaft, erected to their commemoration by a grateful people, witnesses of the inappreciable value of that country and of that freedom, which here exacted such precious sacrifice; and may learn from these silent monitors, as from no living tongue, the solemn responsibilities of the American Citizen.

## ARTICLE XI.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin.* By J. H. M. de D'Aubigne, D. D., Author of the History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Vol. III. France, Switzerland, Geneva. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1864. We have, in a former number of the *Quarterly*, spoken of the earlier volumes of this great work, which has rendered very important service in disclosing the comparatively unknown beginnings of the Genevan Reformation. The present volume introduces us to the times of hostility to the Reform in France and the influence of Calvin in the movement, to his Institutes of

the Christian Religion, the struggles of the Reformation in Switzerland, the Waldenses, and other topics of thrilling interest, connected with this eventful period.

*The Cradle of Antioch, and other Scenes from Christian History in Early Times.* By the Author of the *Chronicles of the Schönborg-Cotta Family*. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1864. The material of this volume has been gathered from English, German, and French histories and is presented with singular beauty and striking interest. The writer possesses, in a remarkable degree, the rare faculty of reproducing in vivid narrative the scenes of the past. In our last issue we specially commended to our readers, by the same gifted author, the *Chronicles of the Schönborg-Cotta Family* in which the Life and Times of Luther are so graphically portrayed, and we are sure that no one, who perused the work, was disappointed in his expectations.

*Memoirs of the Rev. John McDowell, D. D., and the Rev. William A. McDowell* By William B. Sprague, D. D., of Albany. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1864. This volume is worthy the author of the "Annals of the American Puritan," who, by his graphic and faithful delineation of character, has acquired a distinguished reputation, in this as well as in other countries. The subjects of the sketches were honored brothers, ministers of the Presbyterian Church, occupying important positions and exercising a wide-spread influence. Their memory is a precious legacy to the Church. The work also furnishes practical illustrations of what men of true moral, practical piety, without extraordinary talent or great learning, can accomplish.

*A Memoir of the Christian Labors, Pastoral and Philanthropic, of Thomas Chalmers, D. D., LL. D.* By Francis Wayland. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. Dr. Wayland in the preparation of this work has rendered very good service to the Christian public. Whilst Dr. Chalmers' influence in the pulpit and his ecclesiastical position are not overlooked, the principal object of the memoir is to exhibit the pastoral and philanthropic labors of this eminent man, his devotedness to the neglected masses, and to present his modes of doing good, and the general principles by which all his efforts were directed. It cannot fail to assist both ministers and private Christians, who are laboring to promote the best welfare of mankind.

*The Memorial Hour, or the Lord's Supper in its relation to Doctrine and Life.* By Jeremiah Chaplin, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. This is a devotional work, designed to impress upon the heart of the reader the practical meaning and value of this solemn ordinance, and to prepare the mind for its proper observance. The devotional poetry appended to each chapter might have been more judiciously selected.

*Light in Darkness, or Christ discovered in his true Character.* By a Unitarian. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. We read this volume at one sitting with deep interest. The author, Rev. W. L. Gage, was formerly a Unitarian minister, but is now in connection with an orthodox Church. His religious experience will be found valuable to those who in similar circumstances are groping their way in darkness, and all who desire to understand the difference between the character and workings of Unitarianism and those of a pure evangelical faith.

*The Humiliation of Christ in His Death.* By William A. Gould, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. This is an exceedingly

interesting and instructive volume, which no other man could so well have prepared. His recent visit to the Islands enabled him to observe the condition of the native population and the Churches established by the American Missionaries. The work gives, (1.) the Preliminary History; (2.) the Tour of the Islands; (3.) the People of the Islands; (4.) the Ecclesiastical Development; (5.) the other Hawaiian Missions; (6.) the Present Position of the Islands. The report presents one of the most remarkable spiritual revolutions which the world has ever presented on record, the history of a people who, a generation since, was plunged in the darkness of a deplorable heathenism, now regenerated by the power of the Gospel and Missionary labor.

*Work and Play; or Literary Varieties.* By Horace Bushnell, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864. This volume has received its title from the first paper, delivered as an Oration before Harvard University, and consists of occasional discourses and other literary productions on various topics of interest, discussed with all that philosophical and scholastic habit of thought which is so eminently characteristic of the author.

*America and her Commentators.* With a critical sketch of Travel in the United States. By Henry T. Tuckerman. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864. The design of the volume is to give a general view of the trials and transitions of our country, as recorded at various periods in our history, and by writers of different nationalities, and to furnish those desirous of authentic information with a guide to the proper sources. The author is well known, as an interesting and polished writer, and his work exhibits knowledge, industry and critical discrimination.

*The Character of the Gentleman.* By Francis Lieber, LL. D. Third and enlarged edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. This is the substance of an Address, delivered by the author, some years ago, before the students of Miami University. It abounds in useful suggestions and valuable counsels, and is deserving of the beautiful and permanent form, in which it is here presented to the public.

*Notes of Hospital Life* from November 1861 to August 1863. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott. 1864. This is another accession to the literature which the present War has elicited, written by one who ministered to our sick and wounded heroes, and who with a heart alive to their wants and sufferings, could discern the momentous questions involved. On every page is manifest an enlarged and refined culture, a deep sympathy with suffering humanity, a keen insight into man's nature, trust in God, faith in our cause and hope for the future.

*Christian Self-Culture; or Counsels for the beginning and progress of a Christian Life.* By Leonard Bacon, D. D. American Tract Society. Boston. The author is well known as a fine scholar and an experienced Christian minister. In the volume before us he presents practical and important counsels for the beginning and progress of a Christian life. The topics discussed are: (1.) The beginning; (2.) When to begin; (3.) Integrity and amiableness as related to a religious life; (4.) Faith and Manliness; (5.) Enlightened Conscientiousness; (6.) Freedom self-governed; (7.) Steadfastness; (8.) Godliness; (9.) Brotherly Kindness; (10.) Charity; (11.) Christian Growth; (12.) Fruitfulness.

*A Soldier of the Cumberland: A Memoir of Wood Holmes, Jr.* By his Father. With an Introduction by John S. Hart, LL. D. American Tract Society. Boston. This is a most beautiful and touching narrative of the childhood, youth and early manhood of a brave Christian pa-

triot whose talents and many excellencies render him worthy of a permanent record. His life was one of constant trust in God and a most satisfactory refutation of the charge often made that the Army is unfavorable to the maintenance of a man's Christian integrity. The narrative shows how much Christianity ennobles character, and how costly is the sacrifice which the nation is making in its present struggle.

*Jerry and his Friends; or the way to Heaven.* By Alice A. Dodge. American Tract Society. Boston. *Dora Hamilton; or Sunshine and Shadow.* American Tract Society. Boston. These volumes are designed for the young, and are well fitted to interest and do good. We have never seen a publication with the imprimatur of this Society, the tendency of which is not salutary.

*The Young Men of the Bible.* By Rev. Joseph A. Collier, Kingston, N. Y. *The Boy Patriot.* By the Author of "The Blue Flag," &c. Published by the American Tract Society. These books, designed more especially for the young, are specimens of a large number of kindred works from the press of this noble Association. The first is a series of Lectures on prominent characters, mentioned in the Bible, instructive in the lessons communicated, and earnest in the appeals presented. *The Boy Patriot* is a most beautiful character, who carries his principles with him, whithersoever he goes, and maintains his Christian integrity under all circumstances. His faithfulness meets with its appropriate reward. No one can read the book without being deeply impressed with the power of Divine truth and the duty of spreading the Gospel.

*Expository Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism.* By George W. Bethune, D. D. Vol. II. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1864. In a former number we spoke in high terms of the first volume of this work, as a worthy memorial of the learning and eloquence of one who was held in kind remembrance among Christians of all denominations. It is a valuable exposition of the great symbol of his Church, and will, doubtless, be a standard authority. Appended to the work are a full index, a table of reference and a biographical list of writers on the literature of the Catechism, an admirable feature in the work, and worthy of imitation.

*A Hebrew Chrestomathy; or Lessons in Reading and Writing Hebrew.* By William Henry Green, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. New York: John Wiley. 1864. This has been pronounced by the best critics a most excellent work, prepared with "great judgment and scholarly care." We think with the Professor that the Hebrew might with propriety be introduced into our Colleges as an optional study, and facilities furnished for its acquisition. The attempt was made some years ago, in Pennsylvania College, and with success. Quite a number of the students availed themselves of the opportunity afforded.

*Thirteen months in the Rebel Army.* Being a narrative of personal adventures in the infantry, ordnance, cavalry, engineer and hospital service with an exhibition of the power, purposes, earnestness, military despotism and demoralization of the South. By an Impressed New Yorker. New York: A. S. Barnes & Burr. The author of this book is a son of Rev. Dr. Stevenson, of the American Tract Society, who gives an interesting, faithful and thrilling narrative of his experiences and impressions, whilst in the Rebel service.

*The Nation's Sin and Punishment; or the Hand of God visible in the overthrow of Slavery.* By a Chaplain in the United States Army. New York: M. Dondy. American News Company. 1864. This

is another interesting contribution to the Literature of the War. The author was, for thirty years, a resident of the Slave States, and presents with his reflections his own experience and observations of the Institution which is now generally recognized, as the cause of the Rebellion.

*Annual of Scientific Discovery; or Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1864.* Edited by D. A. Wells, M. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864. This is the fifteenth volume of this important serial, to which we have frequently directed the attention of our readers. No one interested in the progress of physical science can well afford to do without the work. A portrait of Gen. Gillmore, U. S. A., accompanies the volume.

*A Text-Book of Geology.* Designed for Schools and Academies. By James D. Dana, LL. D., Silliman Professor of Geology and Natural History in Yale College. Illustrated by 375 Wood cuts. Philadelphia: Theodore Bliss & Co. 1864. This is an abridgement of the author's Manual of Geology which is so well known and regarded, as a work of the highest authority. The numerous illustrations, derived from American facts, in addition to those of Europe and other countries, impart increased interest to the volume. The science, as here presented, is not a mere record of rocks and their fossils, but a history of the earth's continents, seas, mountains, climates and living races.

*The Comprehensive Geography.* By Benjamin F. Shaw & Fordyce A. Allen. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. This is a most excellent work, both in its design and execution. We know of no work of its kind which can be compared to it, or which so fully answers the object intended.

*School Economy.* By James P. Wickersham. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1864. This is an interesting treatise on, (1.) The preparation for the school; (2.) the organization of the school; (3.) the employment of the school; (4.) the government of the school; (5.) the authorities of the school, by an experienced and successful educator who is, at the present time, Principal of the State Normal School.

*The Rebellion Record* (Part XLIV) has just been received and brings down the Documentary History, including the battles of Chicamuga and of Bristow's Station, to November 1863.

*The War for the Unity and Life of the American Nation: A Thanksgiving Discourse,* preached by the Rev. F. W. Conrad, Pastor of the English Lutheran Church of Chambersburg, Pa. June 15, 1864.

*The Providential Position of the Evangelical Churches of this Country at this time.* A Sermon delivered at the opening session of the General Synod at York, Pa., May 5th, 1864. By Samuel Sprecher, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, O. Selinsgrove: *Kirchenbote*. 1864.

*Report on the Organization and Campaigns of the Army of the Potomac:* To which is added an account of the Campaigns in Western Virginia, with plans of Battle Fields. By George B. McClellan. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1864.

*The Extra Hymn Book.* Prepared by Rev. Alfred Taylor. Philadelphia: J. C. Garrigues & Co. 1864.

*Stimmen aus dem Gotteshause.* Predigten aus dem schriftlichen Nachlasse des Ehrw. Dr. C. R. Demme, gewesenen Pastors an der Evangelisch-Lutherischen St. Michaelis- und Zions-Gemeinde in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Verlag von Schaefer und Koradi. 1864.



## CONTRIBUTORS TO THE REVIEW.

The following individuals have contributed articles to the pages of the Evangelical Quarterly Review, since it was first commenced in 1849 :

W. M. Reynolds, D. D.  
 C. Philip Krauth, D. D.  
 Prof. M. L. Stoever, A. M.  
 H. L. Baugher, D. D.  
 C. F. Schaeffer, D. D.  
 H. I. Schmidt, D. D.  
 J. G. Morris, D. D.  
 C. Porterfield Krauth, D. D.  
 J. A. Seiss, D. D.  
 B. Kurtz, D. D., LL. D.  
 J. Few Smith, D. D.  
 S. W. Harkey, D. D.  
 M. Jacobs, D. D.  
 J. W. Richards, D. D.\*  
 G. B. Miller, D. D.  
 T. Stork, D. D.  
 H. Mills, D. D.  
 Rev. B. M. Schmucker, A. M.  
 G. Diehl, D. D.  
 E. Greenwald, D. D.  
 L. Eichelberger, D. D.\*  
 S. S. Schmucker, D. D.  
 Rev. J. N. Hoffman, A. M.\*  
 C. W. Schaeffer, D. D.  
 H. W. Thorpe, A. M.\*  
 Rev. B. Sadtler, A. M.  
 G. A. Lintner, D. D.  
 C. Walker, D. D.  
 Prof. F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M.  
 H. Ziegler, D. D.  
 Rev. M. Loy, A. M.  
 Prof. A. T. Bievent.\*  
 J. Oswald, D. D.  
 Rev. A. Essick, A. M.  
 Prof. D. Worley, A. M.  
 J. L. Schock, D. D.  
 W. B. Sprague, D. D.  
 Rev. P. Bergstresser, A. M.  
 Rev. W. Hull, A. M.  
 Rev. G. A. Wenzel, A. M.  
 S. Sprecher, D. D.  
 Rev. B. J. Koons, A. M.  
 T. H. Stockton, D. D.  
 J. W. Nevin, D. D.  
 Rev. Thomas Lape, A. M.  
 Charles Short, A. M.  
 George C. Maund, A. M.

J. A. Brown D. D.  
 W. J. Mann, D. D.  
 Rev. P. Rizer, A. M.  
 D. F. Bittle, D. D.  
 Rev. F. Springer, A. M.  
 Rev. E. Miller, A. M.  
 Rev. B. Appleby.\*  
 Rev. M. Valentine, A. M.  
 F. R. Anspach, D. D.  
 Rev. J. Ulrich, A. M.\*  
 Rev. A. L. Bridgman, A. M.  
 Rev. C. C. Baughman, A. M.  
 G. Seyffarth, D. D.  
 Rev. J. R. Keiser, A. M.  
 Prof. F. Apel.  
 A. H. Lochman, D. D.  
 Hon. E. McPherson, A. M.  
 Rev. M. Officer.  
 Prof. L. W. Heydenreich.  
 F. W. Conrad, D. D.  
 Rev. J. B. Bittinger A. M.  
 Rev. G. F. Krotel, A. M.  
 Rev. L. E. Albert, A. M.  
 Rev. D. H. Focht, A. M.\*  
 Rev. R. Weiser.  
 Rev. H. S. Lasar.  
 Prof. T. J. Lehman, A. M.  
 Rev. P. Eirich.  
 Rev. E. W. Hutter, A. M.  
 Rev. T. T. Titus, A. M.  
 Rev. R. Hill, A. M.  
 D. McConaughy, A. M.  
 Rev. W. F. Eyster, A. M.  
 C. A. Hay, D. D.  
 Rev. J. G. Butler, A. M.  
 Rev. C. J. Ehrehart, A. M.  
 Prof. H. Coppée, LL. D.  
 H. S. Dickson, D. D.  
 Rev. R. A. Fink, A. M.  
 Rev. H. L. Dox.  
 Rev. M. Sheeleigh, A. M.  
 Rev. J. K. Plitt, A. M.  
 Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, A. M.  
 W. S. Tyler, D. D.  
 S. D. Finckel, D. D.  
 S. Austin Allibone, LL. D.  
 S. E. Becker, A. M.

## INDEX TO VOL. XV.

---

- Alford's Greek Testament, 157  
 Alger's Future Life, 302  
 Allibone, Dr. Art. by, 141, 375  
 American Citizen, Responsibilities of the, 507  
 Amherst College, Reminiscences of, 305  
 Annals of the Army, of the Cumberland, 304  
 Ancient Classics, 498  
 Annual of Scientific Discovery, 588  
 Ansted's Book of Nature, 302  
 Augsburg Confession, 246  
 Atlantic Monthly, 307  
 Bacon's Self-Culture, 587  
 Bacon, W. R. Memoir of, 159  
 Baer, Rev. C. A. Reminiscences of, 584  
 Baptizo, Meaning of, 449  
 Battle of Gettysburg, 225  
 Beecher's Autobiography, 454  
 Bethune's Heidelberg Catechism, 454, 588  
 Bibliotheca Sacra, 307  
 Book of Days, 304  
 Bushnell's Work and Play, 587  
 Call to the Gospel Ministry, 1  
 Calvin's Reformation, 585  
 Carpenter, Rev. W. Reminiscences of, 129  
 Catechisation, 555  
 Chalmer's Memoir, 586  
 Chambers' Encyclopædia, 304  
 Chaplin's Memorial Hour, 586  
 Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution, 453  
 Charles the Bold, 155  
 Christian Character of our Civil Institutions, 452  
 Christian Doctrine of Fasting, 113  
 Christian Doctrine of the Lutheran Church, 190, 485  
 Christ of History, 212  
 Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family, 453  
 Confessors and Confession of Augsburg, 246  
 Conrad, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 246, 457  
 Cripple of Antioch, 586  
 Delitsch, Translation from 410  
 Demme, Rev. Dr. Reminiscences of 428  
 Dickson, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 212  
 Dodd's Common Place Book of the Bible, 306  
 Draper's Intellectual Development, 455  
 Drummond's Christian Life, 454  
 Educated Men, Mistakes of, 375  
 England, May's History of, 304  
 Fasting, 113  
 Federalist, 452  
 German Language, 575  
 Geography, Comprehensive, 589  
 Geology, Text-Book of, 589  
 Gettysburg, Battle of, 225  
 Gilead, Smith's, 305  
 Green's Chrestomathy, 588  
 Greenwald, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 449  
 Hackett's Christian Memorials of the War, 455  
 Halle Patriarchs, 159  
 Hall's Memoir, 305  
 Harbaugh's Works, 157  
 Harper's New Monthly, 307, 456  
 Hart's Golden Censer, 456  
 Hart's Thoughts on Sabbath-schools 466  
 Hawaiian Islands. 586  
 Heidelberg Catechism, 301  
 History of a Future Life, 302  
 Holmes' Memoir, 587  
 Hospital Life, 587  
 Huss, Life and Times of, 156  
 Hutchinson's Music of the Bible, 303  
 Inspiration 293  
 Instruction in Christian Doctrine, 190, 485  
 Jackson, Memoir of, 158  
 Jacobs', Rev. Dr. Art. by, 225  
 Jacobs', Rebel Invasion, 118  
 Jerry and his Friends, 588  
 Jerry, Ainwell, 304

- Johnson's Works and Reviews, 141  
 Koons, Rev. E. J. Art. by 190, 485  
 Krauth, Rev. Dr. Art. by. 566  
 Krotel, Rev. G. F. Art. by, 410  
 Kurtz, Translations from, 190, 485  
 Lange's Commentary, 298  
 Lape, Rev. T. Art. by, 555  
 Lieber's Gentlemen, 587  
 Light in Darkness, 586  
 Literature of the Lutheran Church  
   in the United States, 416  
 Littell's Living Age, 307, 456  
 Lord's Prayer, 410  
 Lord's Supper, 549  
 Lyrics of Loyalty, 307  
 Lyell's Antiquity of Men, 455  
 McDowells', Memoir of, 586  
 Marsh's Man and Nature, 455  
 Maund, G. C. Art. by, 570  
 May's Constitutional History, 304  
 Miller's Witness Papers, 303  
 Ministerial Office, 1  
 Mistakes of Educated Men, 375  
 Morris, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 416  
 Muhlenberg, Prof. F. A. Art. by,  
   351, 549  
 Mystical Union, 564  
 National Almanac. 454  
 Nation's Sin and Punishment, 588  
 Nevin, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 515  
 North American Review, 456  
 Notices of New Publications, 155,  
   301, 449, 585  
 Object of Life, 43  
 Officer, Rev. M. Art. by, 198  
 Our General Synod, 390  
 Parson's Satan Devices, 456  
 Patriarchs of the Lutheran Church,  
   159  
 Paul the Missionary Apostle, 198  
 Peabody's Lectures, 303  
 Peninsular Campaign in Virginia  
   5-9  
 Precious Stones, 544  
 Presence of Christ's glorified body  
   in the Supper, 71, 311  
 Prophetic Times, 307  
 Questions relating to the Lord's  
   Prayer, 410  
 Rebel Army, 588  
 Rebel Invasion, 158  
 Rebellion, Light and Dark of the  
   158  
 Rebellion Record, 158, 307, 466, 589  
 Remarks on Baptism, 449  
 Reminiscences of Deceased Luth-  
   eran Ministers, 129, 428, 584  
 Responsibilities of the American  
   Citizen, 570  
 Revivals, 273  
 Revolution, Chaplains of the, 458  
 Ritter's Geographical Studies, 303  
 Sacramental Meditations on Christ's  
   Presence in the Holy Supper, 71,  
   311  
 Sartorius, Translations from, 71,  
   311  
 Satan's Devices, 456  
 Schaeffer, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 293,  
   544  
 Schaff, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 298  
 Schmid's Dogmatik, Translation  
   from, 564  
 Shedd's Christian Doctrine, 301  
 Short, President Art. by, 498  
 Stanley's Sermons, 156  
 Stearns, Adjutant, 158  
 Sternberg, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 293  
 Stockton, Rev. Dr. Art. by, 43  
 Stoever, Prof. M. L. 129, 159, 390,  
   428, 584  
 Study of the Ancient Classics, 498  
 Study of the German Language, 515  
 Synonyms of the New Testament  
   455  
 Tholuck's Translation from 351  
 Thompson's Mercy Seat, 302  
 Thompson, Memorial of, 305  
 Titcomb's Letters to the Joneses, 305  
 Todd's Question Books 306  
 Trench's Synonyms, 455  
 Tuckerman's America, 587  
 United States Service Magazine, 397  
 Universities, 351  
 Valentine, Rev. M. Art. by, 113  
 Wells' Annual, 589  
 Wenzel, Rev. G. A. Art by, 71, 311  
 Wickersham's School Evening, 589  
 Wisdom of this World, 457  
 Yeager, Rev. J. C. W. Reminiscen-  
   ces of, 135  
 Young Men of the Bible, 588  
 Young Parson, 157  
 Young Patriot, 305  
 Zeller, Translation from, 293, 549,  
   544.











3 2400 00276 4995

PACIFIC LUTHERAN  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
LIBRARY

115  
30  
—  
85-

19266

Evangelical Quarterly  
Review

v.15  
1864

19266

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY  
BERKELEY, CA 94709

